

**Committee on Preparatory Education**  
Minutes

Wednesday, April 29, 2009  
9-10:30 p.m., Kerr Hall Room 129

Present: Nandini Bhattacharya (NSTF Rep), Roxanne Monnet (Staff), Sarah-Hope Parmeter (ELWR Coordinator), Judith Scott (Chair), Tony Tromba, Anna Tsing.

**I. Announcements and minutes.**

Chair Scott reviewed the recent UCOPE meeting for CPE. Academic Senate Vice Chair Henry Powell talked to UCOPE about the draft policy on furloughs and pay cuts. This proposal comes in the form of a change to the Regents Standing Orders to give more independent power to the UC President to enact furloughs and pay cuts during times deemed as emergencies. The divisional Senate committees will be given the opportunity to respond to the proposal.

Susan Wilber spoke to UCOPE on ELWR projections for the coming year. Of the frosh admits for fall 2009, 33 percent are applying for fee waivers for the cost of the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE). It is anticipated that ~17,500 students will need to take the AWPE, even though the number of frosh admits is expected to be reduced by 2,300. The plan is to hire 226 readers for the AWPE in May. If students do not pass the AWPE, they take classes that meet the ELWR at some campuses or classes to prepare them to pass another exam to satisfy ELWR (such as at UCSC). UCOPE is using private vendors as a way of saving costs for administering the AWPE, and will ask them to reduce their expenses. Raising the fee was discussed again this year. The amount needed would be significant-- nearly double. UCOPE selected the AWPE prompt for the May meeting at the last meeting and calibrated the scoring system at this meeting. Campus reps reported how budget cuts may impact their writing programs. UCSC looks good as far as this cut, but it is thought that this is due to prior cuts to UCSC's Writing Program that brought them down to the minimum needed to support ELWR and the C1/C2 requirements.

On other business, it was reported that the legislature is currently unwilling to give UC the \$20M needed to reinstate employer contributions for the UC Retirement Program. UC is the only state entity not receiving retirement program support from the state. Over the past 18 years, UC has saved the state ~\$2B on such contributions. This argument is not compelling to the legislature to restore their contribution. Not reinstating employer and employee contributions has begun to cause significant concern about the financial future of UCRP.

Members were reminded of the May 20 Senate Meeting and reception.

Since the last meeting it was confirmed that the Psychology Department is considering AMS 2 and Math 4 as alternatives for their precalculus requirement, which is usually satisfied through completion of Math 3. To date, a formal request has not been submitted to CEP to change the requirement in the catalog. Psychology is accepting Math 4 taken spring 2009 as a substitution for Math 3 by petition to the department. There is a complication with AMS 2 as an alternative. Since students take AMS 5 for the degree, Psychology will not want to count AMS 2 unless students take it before they have taken AMS 5.

Member Tromba confirmed that the Math Department will offer Math 4 again next year and is seeking space to allow the audience to double, in response to students from Psychology taking the course. Sociology has not yet proposed to reinstate their Math requirement but is discussing it.

At the next meeting members would like to discuss concern regarding the number of pre-admissions requirements that department are instituting for their majors. Specifically, they are concerned that there be oversight to ensure that students can get degrees of interest to them in a timely fashion.

The January minutes were accepted.

## **II. Proposed Revision to Senate Regulations Governing Undergraduate Admissions.**

CPE discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Regulations governing undergraduate admissions. These are being proposed to bring Regulations into compliance with the admissions eligibility criteria adopted by the UC Regents earlier this year. CPE's response will focus on the areas of their charge related to preparatory education in mathematics and English.

UC admissions currently require three years of Mathematics. The Committee would like to see four years of High School Mathematics required for UC eligibility. CPE will strongly recommend in its response that students who are interested in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) majors take a year of precalculus as one of the four classes, in preparation for the University STEM courses.

In addition, CPE agreed that four courses of English is an appropriate requirement for admission, but would like at least one of these courses to involve writing on topics beyond literature. This change in subject area writing is aligned with the new UCSC Disciplinary Communication requirement and would begin to address the same concerns.

The letter will be finalized by the Committee over email for Friday's deadline.

## **III. ELWR Reports.**

UCSC students taking the November 2009 AWPE had a much higher fail rate on the AWPE than in previous years. The reason for this is unknown and is anomalous. After the annual portfolio review for these entering students, UCSC's entering student had basically the same pass rate as the prior year. This outcome suggests that the prompt did not work well for these students since the final results after portfolio review did not change from the prior year.

ELWR Coordinator Parmeter raised concern about students who are at UCSC through education abroad programs and need to take writing classes but are unable to do so due to capacity limitation.

The Committee received the Learning Support Services report on tutoring in core courses. The report documents a significant disparity on the AWPE scores for EOP-eligible students and non-EOP eligible students. There is speculation that acculturation to academia may play a part in why these students scored lower or that these students may need to work more hours than the others, resulting in less time to prepare for courses and the AWPE. CPE wonders whether there could be data to support these speculations and whether it might be encouraged that non-ELWR satisfied student receive financial aid other than workstudy during their first year to allow more time to focus on more classes toward the ELWR.

Coordinator Parmeter shared that there are some pilot programs underway that may improve the situation for ELWR satisfaction next year. College 8 has proposed to CEP that student would take 3 additional credits in their core course to allow more focus on writing. Also, College 10 has proposed to CEP a two-quarter core course sequence that would allow the fall offering more focus on writing.

The Committee discussed briefly what experimental programs might be created to give students more time with faculty as a way of improving early acculturation to academia. Consideration of what students in the Bridge program take, coupled with a survey of those students to gain information on how effective these courses were, could help to identify various options for the larger audience of students.

This topic will be on the next meeting agenda. Coordinator Parmeter will provide a draft letter for CPE to consider.

So attests,

Judith Scott, Chair  
Committee on Preparatory Education