

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY Annual Report 2019-20

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

I. Introduction

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) had an exceptionally challenging year in 2019-20, having a key role in the twin crises that affected UC Santa Cruz. The issues discussed by the committee, and decisions that were made, are discussed in this report.

In the fall term, CEP presented [a report](#) (AS/SCP/1960) to the Senate, showing that undergraduate education at UC Santa Cruz is under-resourced compared to even those UC campuses — such as UC Riverside — which we would hope to be comparable to or better than. This is the root of many of our problems related to undergraduate education. To our knowledge, there has been no progress on this issue.

In the winter term, CEP dealt with the impact of the strike launched by graduate teaching assistants, which resulted in a large number of grades for Fall 2019 and Winter 2020 not being submitted in time. CEP issued a series of letters providing guidance to departments and adaptations of standard policies, balancing the need to maintain academic standards with the need for students to get their grades in time. These letters are published on CEP's correspondence [website](#)¹ and are therefore not repeated here.

Near the end of the winter term, in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the campus abruptly moved to remote instruction. In collaboration with other Senate committees, and sometimes with the Administration, CEP issued another set of letters clarifying which policies were being waived or loosened, and which were not. Many decisions were delegated from CEP to the departments. This correspondence is also available on the committee's [website](#).

II. Classroom Utilization

Availability of classrooms on campus continues to be a problem, temporarily masked by the transition to remote instruction. For Fall 2019, the initial demand for small classrooms was more than 100% of the number of available time slots. Due to cancellations, this eventually dropped to less than 100%. This situation will be made worse when the Kresge Classroom Project is launched, since it will eliminate one classroom in this size range. CEP presented the Administration with a set of possibilities that might quickly increase the supply of such classrooms. The committee has not heard back from the Administration about this. The availability of classrooms with 100-199 seats will also face a severe crunch when the Kresge Classroom Project is launched, since a classroom in this size range will also be eliminated.

Faced with this challenge, knowing that it takes time for new classrooms to be developed, and not seeing any action from the Administration on this front, CEP decided that it would not approve any new academic programs that place additional demands on classrooms in a term (i.e. Fall, Winter or Spring) and a size-range for which the utilization is already at or above 90%. We hope

¹ <https://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/cep-committee-on-educational-policy/cep-correspondence/index.html>

that the Administration will take action to solve this problem, allowing CEP to reverse this decision instead of going still further.

III. Quality of Academic Programs

According to the bylaws of the Academic Senate, CEP's primary charge is "the quality of academic programs". Accordingly, CEP looked into major programs in four departments to see if their requirements were within the range expected from other UC campuses, or if they needed upgrading. In the case of two departments, changes were made that partly or fully addressed CEP's concerns. In the case of a third, the department will propose a curricular upgrade in Fall 2020, failing which the program will be suspended. In the fourth case, the department was open to the idea of making the change needed to bring their program within the UC norm, but the lack of classroom space prevented this from being explored further. We recommend that this effort be continued with other departments.

There was no progress with the efforts to strengthen the College Scholars Program. The additional resources required are not insignificant, but they should not be prohibitive. Considering that there was no progress before the current budget crisis, it is unlikely that there will be any improvement in the near future.

IV. Impaction and the CSE Department

CEP also worked with the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) to release a [report](#) (AS/SCP/1964) on which departments are particularly "impacted", i.e. have their academic programs under strain because of insufficient resources to deal with the number of students in their programs. This is obviously related to the previous item, since departments under pressure are in the most danger of seeing their academic programs degraded.

The CPB-CEP report identified several departments that are, to varying degrees, impacted. Among these, the Computer Science and Engineering Department was clearly the worst off. (This is the only department that has officially been designated as impacted, resulting in controls on the number of students admitted each year.) CEP advised the Administration about what resources would be needed for the department to be able to manage its academic programs, failing which the Major Qualification GPA for the Computer Science B.S. would be raised from 2.8 to 3.0, with further steps possible in 2020-21. The qualification GPA has been raised to 3.0 in the 2020-21 General Catalog. With 900 students expected to enter the Computer Science B.S. in Fall 2020 instead of the annual target of 800, expected — with the dearth of faculty — to result in the quality of classes and students' access to them to suffer, it is likely that further steps will be needed.

The situation with the Psychology Department and the MCD Biology Department is expected to be much improved in 2020-21 compared to 2019-20 because of a large number of faculty hires. Continued monitoring of these departments will be desirable.

V. Preparatory education and placement

a. Academic Literacy Curriculum

The Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC), providing instruction in basic reading, comprehension and writing skills, was introduced in 2018-19. Reports about its effectiveness have been reviewed

by CEP, and are discussed in detail in a separate report (see Appendix I).. Overall, the ALC seems to be working well, but with some concerns:

- International multilingual students are struggling with College 1 and subsequent writing courses. CEP has requested that the Administration fund the development of an online language course that can be taken by these students in the summer prior to matriculation. This course can be developed by the Department of Languages and Applied Linguistics, in consultation with the colleges and the Writing Program. (At this point, CEP does not support adding another required course to the ALC in the fall, lengthening the chain of courses that have to be completed by Senate deadlines.) There has been no progress on this front so far.
- The budgeting for the ALC remains an unresolved issue. The Humanities Division contends that it is not provided sufficient funds for the Writing Program component of the ALC, even though this is supposed to be a budget line-item distinct from the rest of the Humanities Division. This claim has been pending for more than a year with the central Administration. Students have to complete ELWR by the end of their first year and the Composition (C) requirement by the end of their second year according to Senate regulations, and it would be unfortunate if inadequate funding were to result in students having to leave the University. This problem has worsened because of the outcome of Directed Self Placement (see next paragraph).
- The Writing Program and the Humanities Division have to plan properly so that enough sections of each of the Writing courses in the ALC are offered each year. Although there have been no major problems, students sometimes have to struggle to get into the courses they need. Although the curricular planning is complicated, it is essential.

b. Directed Self-Placement

With the uncertainty surrounding the systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE) in the year 2020 as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, campuses have moved to their own placement systems to channel students into the appropriate writing courses. Even before this happened, the AWPE was critiqued by the deans of undergraduate education at the UC campuses as being a poor placement mechanism. At UC Santa Cruz, the 2020 placement has occurred through Directed Self Placement (DSP), where a student is guided through a process that enables them to make an informed choice about which writing course would be most appropriate for them. DSP was developed by the Writing Program, and endorsed by CEP in Spring 2020. From September 1, 2020, when the oversight responsibilities of the Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) will be formally transferred to CEP, the committee should work with the Writing Program to confirm that DSP is working properly.

For Fall 2020, DSP has had the unexpected outcome that approximately two-thirds of students have chosen WRIT 1, including a substantial number of ELWR-satisfied students. Normally, one-third of the students are placed in WRIT 1. This situation needs attention and careful planning early in the fall, by the Writing Program, the Humanities Division, CEP and the central Administration.

c. Math Placement and Instruction

A CEP subcommittee reviewed UC Santa Cruz's mathematics placement system and the teaching in introductory mathematics courses, and made recommendations. After discussion in CEP, a letter

was released to the relevant deans and department chairs for comments, so that CEP — overseeing placement systems under Senate bylaws — can reach a decision. The letter has been published on CEP's correspondence [website](#).

VI. Graduate Student Instructors

CEP participated in preparing the proposal from the Committee on Courses of Instruction to strengthen the criteria for blanket approval of Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs). After feedback was obtained from departments and the Administration, primary responsibility for this project was transferred to CEP, and an updated proposal circulated to departments in the summer. The proposal included training for GSIs, limits on class size and supervision of teaching assistants, proper mentoring support from the faculty mentors, and a provision that GSIs must not have academic integrity actions on their record. Final decisions will be made by CEP in Fall 2020, to be implemented partly from Fall 2021 and partly from Fall 2022.

CEP also proposed a limit of 25% for the fraction of upper division courses from a course sponsoring agency that can be taught by GSIs. In Spring 2020, when CEP learned that the percentage of GSI-taught upper division courses in one department was well above this threshold, the committee suspended their academic program while allowing their courses to continue. If the department is able to fix this problem in the near future, the program can be reactivated.

In Spring 2020, CEP approved a policy that faculty mentors of GSIs should be given co-instructor status in the Canvas shell for the course.

VII. Courses and course-sponsoring agencies

In response to an inquiry from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education and the Council of Provosts, CEP stated that a (Senate approved) course must

- Provide sufficient interaction with an instructor (i.e. a person holding one of the instructional titles² in the University of California for the course)
- Involve evaluation of the work of students
- Consist of material or skills taught that has value going beyond UC Santa Cruz.

The number of credits for the course must be appropriate for the amount of academic activity associated with the course, consistent with systemwide Senate regulation SR 760. CEP later further clarified that Senate approved courses must be sponsored by a group of Senate faculty with the resources available to offer courses.

In Summer 2020, CEP wrote a letter to the Senate Chair expressing concern about the proliferation of “certificate programs” that are not clearly distinguishable from Senate approved certificates, which is problematic in view of the exclusive authority over certificates given to the Senate by Regents’ Standing Order 105.2.a. This will have to be pursued at the systemwide level in 2020-21.

VIII. Credit for unarticulated courses

In response to a query from the Admissions Office, CEP clarified that when a student has completed a course at another institution which is not articulated to a UC Santa Cruz course,

² See APM 110-4.15 and APM 112.

departments are free to accept the two courses as being equivalent for the purpose of fulfilling the course requirements for their academic programs or for the purpose of their transfer screening requirements, but this should not be entered as “Other Credit” in the Academic Information System. “Other Credit” results in the student being treated as having completed the UC Santa Cruz course for all purposes, including as a prerequisite for courses offered by other course-sponsoring agencies, and this can only be approved by the course-sponsoring agency for the UC Santa Cruz course.

CEP recommended that Admissions explore whether it can post accredited courses for incoming transfer students before they enroll for their first term, reducing unnecessary workload for departmental staff and allowing them to spend more time on unarticulated courses. CEP further recommended that a database be created, where information about courses outside California community colleges (i.e. not on ASSIST) could be entered when they are reviewed, whether the outcome was favorable or unfavorable, so that the same course would not have to be reviewed twice. This would reduce the workload for the Admissions Office and departments.

IX. General Catalog and Navigator

This was the second year of the Curriculum Approval and Tracking (CAT) system. After a challenging launch in 2018-19, the process was much smoother this year. It was possible to release the draft catalog before continuing students enrolled in classes for Fall 2020 because enrollment was delayed (due to COVID-19), enabling them to see new course offerings and new programs. It would be desirable if this could become a regular feature.

CEP and Graduate Council continue to request improvements to the CAT system. These fall in three categories: changes that would benefit faculty and staff entering course proposals and program statements, changes that would benefit Senate committees reviewing these proposals, and changes that would help the end-users reading the published catalog. Several of these requests have been fulfilled; others are still pending.

One of the significant improvements is to allow external web pages to link to a specific section in a program statement in the catalog, instead of the top of the program statement. It should now be possible to phase out the common practice of departments duplicating catalog information on their website, which after a few years can lead to inconsistencies between the two versions.

There is a lot of information about undergraduate programs that is useful for students but is not in the General Catalog. The Division of Undergraduate Education (UE) has started a project to revive an upgraded version of the UCSC Navigator, which would contain all this supplementary information in an easy-to-read form. The project was at a preliminary stage in 2019-20, but CEP should consult with UE about it in 2020-21. Having multiple, sometimes inconsistent, sources of information for undergraduate students was identified as a significant source of extra work for advisors and of confusion for students.

As a related venture, UE is proposing to reorganize the advising clusters for students who, when they enter UC Santa Cruz, are not clear about which major they wish to pursue. First-year academic planners that give students in a major a picture of the different majors in their cluster will be developed, so that they can choose between them. The four-year graduation rate at UC Santa Cruz

is weighed down by students who are undeclared at the time of matriculation, and helping them to make up their minds quickly will be beneficial.

X. IRAPS Dashboards

At CEP's request, the Institutional Research and Academic Policy Studies unit (IRAPS) developed a set of tools that allow various aspects of how a department's courses and curricula are functioning to be analyzed and visualized. These include migration between majors, course outcomes, and when students take courses. There is also a dashboard that shows student success in a major based on their performance in certain courses in their first year. Final adjustments are being made to these dashboards, after which CEP should decide in the fall who should have access to these. We hope they will be useful to departments and CEP for analysis and planning.

IRAPS is also developing a dashboard to assess proposed or existing major qualification policies. The design of this dashboard is based on CEP decisions during the last few years. It should be ready in 2020-21.

XI. Academic Program Establishment, Modification, Suspension and Discontinuance

- The committee participated in the review of the latest revision of the policy "Academic Programs and Units: Policy and Procedures Governing Establishment, Disestablishment and Change" (the APU). CEP made extensive revisions to Appendix C, which specifies the structure of undergraduate degree program proposals, to simplify and reduce the requirements wherever possible.
- A new Applied Mathematics B.S. was approved, after the Administration provided the resources that the department said they would need to launch the program.
- A new Mathematics B.S. was approved, and the Mathematics Education concentration in the Mathematics B.A. program was converted to a separate degree program.
- A new Education, Democracy and Justice B.A. was approved, with the provision of limited enrollment per year because of classroom availability constraints. (See Item II in this report.) This limit will be reviewed more broadly in Fall 2020.
- A new Biotechnology B.A. program (sponsored by the Biomolecular Engineering Department), aimed at students with a broad range of interests with biomolecular engineering content, was approved.
- The Agroecology concentration in the Environmental Studies B.A. program was converted to a separate degree program with a greater emphasis on agroecology.
- Two new concentrations in the Music B.A. were approved: Global Music, and Contemporary Practices. The existing B.A. was converted into a concentration in Western Art Music. As part of this process, CEP also reviewed the academic requirements for the Western Art Music Minor and the Jazz Minor, and asked for changes. These changes were made, and the Jazz Minor renamed as the Jazz, Spontaneous Composition, and Improvisation Minor.
- A new concentration in Accounting was approved in the Business Management Economics B.A. Students who are aiming for a career as a Chartered Public Accountant take these courses at present, and the concentration gives their efforts recognition.
- A Black Studies Minor was approved. This program was sponsored by the Critical Race and Ethnic Studies program. In the process, CEP sought and received assurances from the

Dean of Humanities about the adequateness of funding levels for Critical Race and Ethnic Studies.

- A proposal from the program faculty to suspend the Technology and Information Management B.S. because of inadequate resources was received by CEP. The committee endorsed the faculty's stand, and asked the Administration to provide additional resources and an improved governance structure if the program was to continue. The resources have been provided, and the governance structure is still being finalized. We expect this to be resolved in 2020-21.
- The History of Consciousness Minor was suspended by CEP due to a lack of faculty-taught courses at the upper division level.
- CEP requested that a proposal to upgrade the Neuroscience B.S. program be submitted in Fall 2020, failing which the program would be suspended from Fall 2021. CEP informed the Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) about this. After discussion, CAFA determined that it would be best to admit students to the program for Fall 2021 with the expectation that it would continue; if it was suspended, the students could move to one of the other majors in the MCD Biology Department.
- The German Studies B.A., which had been suspended two years ago because of insufficient faculty in the discipline, was discontinued because the situation had not been corrected.
- The Environmental Geology concentration in the Earth Sciences B.S. program was discontinued by CEP, in accordance with the recommendation of the External Review Committee as something that should be done after the Environmental Science B.S. was established.
- The 3+3 Juris Doctorate program with the UC Hastings College of Law was discontinued, following lack of interest from Hastings College.

XII. Other Business

CEP met with Interim Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Success, Jennifer Baszile. This was in connection with the committee's push for an improved Career Center, which is detailed in the 2018-19 Annual Report from the committee. The discussion was preliminary but productive. Next year's committee is urged to continue this engagement.

CEP participated in the external reviews of the following departments: Computational Media, History of Art and Visual Culture, Theater Arts, Languages and Applied Linguistics, Mathematics, Psychology, History of Consciousness, Philosophy, Art, Astronomy, Earth and Planetary Sciences, Music, History, and Anthropology. Different departments were at different stages of the external review process.

CEP reviewed several universities abroad for inclusion in the UC Santa Cruz Global Exchange program. The inclusion of these universities was proposed by the interim Vice Provost of Global Engagement. CEP approved most of the universities, but rejected a few. For the future, it stated that it would attach weight to the international rankings of universities that are proposed, and only approve universities that are better than UC Santa Cruz.

The CEP Policies [website](#) continued to be updated. Most of the adjustments were minor. The Catalog Rights [policy](#) was reworded to clarify that catalog rights only guarantee that if a student completes the requirements for a program as published in their catalog, they will have completed

the program. Catalog rights do not guarantee the availability of courses; departments, CEP and the Administration try to ensure reasonable availability of courses so that students are not stuck in the middle of a program.

As in previous years, CEP was invited to participate in the annual FTE allocation process through CPB. For the first time, the entire committee was able to discuss the FTE requests, instead of only the CEP Chair. The CEP Chair also participated in CPB's consultations with the divisional deans. The committee made its recommendations to CPB.

CEP participated in Senate review at the divisional level of the restructuring of the Office of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, the restructuring of the Division of Student Success, the Partner Hire Policy, the ACE Internationalization Draft Goals and Action Plan, and the 5-Year Perspectives for academic programs. At the systemwide level, CEP participated in reviews of the UCDC Center and the report on standardized tests.

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas Bonett

Kate Edmunds

Lindsay Hinck, Chair CCI, *ex officio*

Dongwook Lee

Ronnie Lipshutz

Pradip Mascharak

Richard Montgomery

Tchad Sanger, *ex officio*

Matt Wagers

Onuttom Narayan, Chair

Joy Hagen, NSTF Representative

Marlena DeCastro, Student Representative (W,S)

Manel Camps, Provost Representative

August 31, 2020

Appendix I: Report to the Senate re The Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC)

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

The Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC) was introduced at UC Santa Cruz in the Fall of 2018. The components are

- A restructured College Core course (called College 1, with “College” replaced with the appropriate course code for each of the ten colleges). This is a one-quarter 5-credit course in each college. The multiple versions for students with different levels of writing skills have been eliminated. The course teaches critical reading and critical thinking skills, and is a prerequisite to the Writing courses in the ALC, enabling them to be taught more efficiently. However, College 1 does not teach writing.
- A course, WRIT 1, that is for students who enter UC Santa Cruz without satisfying the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). An alternative version of this course, WRIT 1E, is aimed at multilingual students. College 1 is a prerequisite to both these courses.
- A course, WRIT 2, that is taken by all students after satisfying ELWR and completing College 1. An alternative honors version of this course, WRIT 2H, caters to students who wish to go beyond the level of WRIT 2 and are (by various measures) considered suitable for the course.
- A “Multilingual Curriculum,” consisting of WRIT 25 and WRIT 26, for multilingual students who need extra training in academic reading, writing, listening, and speaking. These students are asked to start in WRIT 25 or WRIT 26, depending on their level, after which they take WRIT 1 or 1E. College 1 is not a prerequisite for these courses. The Multilingual Curriculum existed before the ALC, but it was limited to international students with F1 Visa status; it is now open to all students for whom it is appropriate.

With such a major restructuring of a foundational part of the curriculum, it is important to see what the outcomes are, and to make adjustments where needed. The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) has reviewed the assessment studies for the Academic Literacy Curriculum (ALC), specifically for College 1 (fall 2019) and Writing Program courses (fall 2018-fall 2019). These studies were conducted by the Institutional Research and Academic Policy Studies (IRAPS) unit. The following report

- Summarizes the major findings from the assessment studies and offers recommendations for the Colleges and the Writing Program.
- Discusses the special provision endorsed by CEP for the winter-term core course STEV 2 at Stevenson College.
- Describes the change from 2020 in how students satisfy ELWR before coming to UC Santa Cruz; this change was triggered by the challenges associated with the pandemic, but it is possible that the change will not be temporary.
- Touches upon the budgetary challenge to provide adequate funding for the ALC.

College 1 Assessment Findings

Based on its 2018 assessment of College 1 (Academic Literacy and Ethos), the Colleges revised the College 1 curriculum for fall 2019 to better serve international students. In this effort, the Colleges implemented new specialized programs, including a multilingual tutoring program at College Nine and College Ten and the use of “Class Captains” at Crown College. IRAPS generated

two assessment studies for College 1, one that measured the success of these programs and one that compared fall 2018 international students' academic proficiencies in College 1 with the fall 2019 cohort.

Overall, the studies show that (1) the Colleges' specialized programs positively benefit international students; (2) international students in fall 2019 developed higher proficiencies in understanding the relationship between genre and context than the fall 2018 cohort; and (3) international students in fall 2019 developed slightly higher proficiencies in analyzing texts to identify main ideas and use a range of strategies to understand texts. Further, the studies indicate that the fall 2019 cohort had an increase in an academic sense of belonging to their college as a result of College 1, as well as a higher frequency of interaction with course faculty and course assistants.

With respect to (1), students who participated in Crown's Class Captain program and College Nine and College Ten's multilingual tutoring program experienced more success in applying reading strategies to difficult readings, felt more connected with the course readings, and were more engaged in College 1 overall. These students were also more likely to make use of campus academic resources and to communicate with their peers, faculty, and course assistants. Thus, these programs positively impacted students' learning experiences in College 1.

With respect to (2) and (3), while international students improved in all criteria assessed, students' rubric results demonstrated language-based differences for both the fall 2018 and fall 2019 cohorts. For instance, late bilingual students (those who started learning English after the age of five), demonstrated lower proficiencies across all criteria than their peers who learned English and another language before the age of five. Additionally, students who placed into the Writing Program's Multilingual Curriculum (WRIT 25 or WRIT 26) demonstrated some improvement in analyzing texts and understanding the relationship between genre and context, and fewer students generally or fully met expectations for use of reading strategies. These findings indicate the need for additional language support for late bilingual students overall and for students who place into the Multilingual Curriculum.

Recommendations

1. Overall, international students' improved experiences in College 1 in fall 2019 suggest that the curricular interventions at Crown College, College Nine, and College Ten are serving students well. These programs should be continued and expanded to other colleges to the extent that there is student demand.
2. To continue supporting international students' language development, Global Engagement should work with the Department of Languages and Applied Linguistics to develop an online language course appropriate for students who are late learners of English, to be offered in the summer, ahead of the academic year. Such a course would help these students develop the speaking, listening, and reading skills needed to better acclimate to the demands of College 1.

Writing Program Assessment Findings

The Writing Program collaborated with IRAPS to assess the fall 2018 cohort of ALC students and evaluated students' proficiencies in four courses: WRIT 25, Writing about Place, and WRIT 26, Writing about Language (courses that comprise the Multilingual Curriculum); WRIT 1, Introduction to Composition; and WRIT 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry. Each of these assessment studies focused on the course learning outcomes and evaluated students' performance across subpopulations, with attention to equity. The overall target for students who met or exceeded expectations in any given criteria was 75%.

In the **Multilingual Curriculum** (MLC), students were assessed for all learning outcomes, and most students met or exceeded expectations, with the exception of one criterion, "use of language." Only 73% of students who began their ALC pathway in WRIT 25 met or exceeded expectations in this criterion, indicating that these students need more time to develop their use of language and that they may benefit from additional language support.

In **WRIT 1**, students were assessed specifically in their cognitive and metacognitive abilities, and a majority of students met the 75% threshold, with the exception of one criterion, "developing a strengths plan," where only 71% of students met or exceeded expectations. Of note in this study were the following findings: (1) With respect to metacognition, MLC students outperformed their peers, which suggests that the MLC effectively introduced students to these important skills and that they were able to build upon them in WRIT 1. Additionally, across the criteria, MLC students who took WRIT 1 demonstrated similar proficiencies to their non-MLC peers, indicating that WRIT 25 and WRIT 26 adequately prepare MLC students for their work in WRIT 1. (2) Winter quarter WRIT 1 students outperformed spring quarter WRIT 1 students in all criteria except "developing a strengths plan. The lower results in spring reflect students who repeated WRIT 1 or were not enrolled in the MLC. (3) 81-89% of students with AWPE scores of 6 (highest level of preparation) demonstrated developing/advanced proficiency across the criteria, compared with 65-69% of students with scores of 2-5, 2-5E, and 6E.

The Writing Program also offers WRIT 1E, designed for heritage speakers and multilingual students (international or domestic). Overall, students in WRIT 1 and 1E displayed similar proficiencies, but no analysis was conducted to determine if the students the course was designed for are better served by WRIT 1 or WRIT 1E. Thus, future assessments may focus on this aspect.

In **WRIT 2**, students' proficiencies in information literacy were assessed. Overall, a majority of students met or exceeded expectations (81-88%). Additionally, in a survey-based assessment, most students indicated improvement in information literacy over the course of the quarter.

The assessment results reveal differences in student performances based on curricular pathways and student preparation levels. For instance, ELWR-Satisfied students performed consistently better across all categories than ELWR-Required students who took WRIT 1 before WRIT 2 and ELWR-Required students who took WRIT 25 and/or WRIT 26 before WRIT 2. These differences were most notable in two criteria: (1) in "appropriately cites source material," only 75% of students who took WRIT 1 and 67% of MLC students met or exceeded expectations, compared with 84% of ELWR-Satisfied students; and (2) in "appropriately attributes source material," only 71% of MLC students met or exceeded expectations, compared with 89% of ELWR-Satisfied students and

83% of WRIT 1 students. As a whole, however, MLC students performed similarly demonstrated similar competencies as their ELWR-Required peers who took WRIT 1 before WRIT 2.

The overall differences in student performance based on curricular pathways in the ALC indicates that information literacy outcomes should be articulated and scaffolded in College1 and WRIT 1 to better prepare students for WRIT 2. Specifically, this includes the explicit teaching of digital research skills and the integration of library resources into class assignments and instruction.

WRIT 2 students were also evaluated according to curricula: legacy students who took WRIT 2 in their second year of enrollment and were part of the old writing curriculum and ALC students who took WRIT 2 in their first year of enrollment. Overall, there were statistically significant differences in ALC students' performance vs. non-ALC students' performance, indicating that the ALC better prepared students for WRIT 2. However, with respect to incoming preparation levels, the ALC provided only slightly better support for ELWR-Required students, compared with the old curriculum.

With respect to WRIT 2 Honors, no assessment data was provided.

Recommendations

1. WRIT 1E and WRIT 2H should be assessed in the future to determine how well these courses serve students.
2. Similar to the College 1 recommendation, international students, especially those in the MLC, may benefit from additional instruction in the summer ahead of the academic year. Such a course may better prepare students for the MLC, WRIT 1, and WRIT 2.
3. There is concern about the Writing Program's ability to offer enough seats of each course each term. While the program has bolstered its summer course offerings of WRIT 2 (10 sections) and WRIT 1 (1 section), the program needs to investigate potential bottlenecks for students who need to complete the C Requirement by the start of their seventh quarter.

For instance, in the 2020-2021 AY, there are roughly 25 students who will start their seventh quarter of enrollment without having met the C Requirement; while a blanket petition has been submitted to CCI to resolve this issue, this number is compounded by an additional 2100 returning students who will need WRIT 2 in the 2020-2021 AY (in addition to the new cohort of ELWR-Satisfied ALC students in 2020-2021 AY). As a result, the Writing Program needs to hire additional lecturers to provide enough seats in WRIT 2, specifically, to ensure timely progress to degree.

Overall Assessment of the ALC

The ALC is a joint program administered by two academic units (the Colleges and the Writing Program), each of which oversee specific courses in the curriculum (College 1 for the Colleges and Writing 25, 26, 1, and 2 for the Writing Program) and provides assessment of those courses. Thus, formal evaluation of the ALC has been conducted on a course-by-course basis, rather than holistically across all courses.

However, IRAPS conducted a correlation analysis of the learning outcomes in College 1, WRIT 25, WRIT 26, WRIT 1/1E, and WRIT 2, focusing on metacognition and genre awareness. This analysis demonstrated the following: (1) For MLC students who took College 1 and then moved to WRIT 1 and WRIT 2 respectively, most students continually met or exceeded expectations as they advanced in the curriculum; (2) Most MLC students who underperformed in College 1 and the MLC improved their proficiencies in WRIT 1; (3) Most ELWR-Satisfied students who underperformed in College 1 met or exceeded expectations in WRIT 2; and (4) entering students who were most prepared in College 1 and exceeded expectations tended to exceed expectations in WRIT 2.

These results show that students do appear to improve their proficiencies over the course of the ALC, at least in some criteria.

Recommendations

In the future, the Colleges and the Writing Program should coordinate their assessment efforts to better understand student migration through the ALC and the overall proficiencies students develop as a result of the ALC. Such assessment efforts may paint a better picture of the extent to which the ALC prepares students for their disciplinary communication courses.

Stevenson College Core Course

In 2015-16, when CEP was specifying the conditions that the proposals from the colleges and Writing Program for a revised curriculum would have to satisfy, it stated that the college core courses would all be limited to one term. Colleges had a variety of different systems at that point, as detailed in [this](#) report. With the exception of Stevenson College, these were all aimed at students who had not satisfied ELWR prior to matriculating at UCSC. Stevenson College, on the other hand, had had a two-quarter core course requirement for all its students for many years.

When the ALC was proposed in 2017, it had a one-quarter College 1 core course for all colleges. It was then approved by CEP and presented to the Academic Senate, where the enabling legislation was approved. With the exception of Stevenson College, all the variants of the college core course — which were aimed at ELWR-required students — were discontinued. However, the second quarter of the Stevenson College core course, renumbered as STEV 2, remained as a college requirement.

This situation was reviewed by CEP in 2019. Following discussion with the college, CEP asked IRAPS to survey Stevenson College alumni about their two-quarter core course. The results were available to CEP in early 2020. Although the response rate was not very high, the key conclusions of the survey were that

- Nearly 90% of the respondents said that the core course was essential or helpful for their academic growth.
- Approximately one-third of respondents said that Core influenced their choice of major, and approximately one quarter of respondents said that it influenced their choice of career.
- Approximately 80% of the respondents said that a multi-term Core was essential or helpful for them to gain academic skills and social connections.

Keeping these in mind, CEP decided to approve the continuation of STEV 2 as a college requirement at Stevenson College, with the following provisions:

- Stevenson College students in the Multilingual Curriculum, i.e. students who place into WRIT 25 or WRIT 26 upon matriculation at UC Santa Cruz, would be exempt from being required to take STEV 2.
- On the Stevenson College website describing the core course, and in the program statement for the college in the General Catalog, students in major programs with a large number of requirements would be advised to consider carefully if a second core course would fit their schedule.
- Entering frosh would only be placed in Stevenson College if they listed it as their first or second preference. That is, a student who did not list any college, or listed Stevenson College as their third preference (or lower), would not be placed in Stevenson College.

These were agreed to by the college and the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education.

Changes to Writing Course Placement for 2020-2021

On March 12, 2020, the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) sent a memo to all UCs announcing that the in-person Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) would not be offered. Because this exam, in conjunction with other standardized tests, is used to determine whether or not incoming students have met the system-wide Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), all UC campuses were asked to develop localized placement processes to serve students who would have otherwise taken the AWPE.³ For UCSC, the total number of students who would typically take the AWPE for placement into developmentally appropriate writing courses is ~1900.

After consulting with colleagues at UCD, UCSB, and UCI — all of whom had started developing localized placement processes modeled on directed self-placement — UCSC designed and implemented Directed Self-Placement (DSP). DSP, as a whole, is a placement process that guides students in selecting the course that is right for them. Research shows that it empowers students, and that with support, students typically do pick the courses that are best for them. There is also evidence that students are more invested in courses when they participate in the decision-making process (Gere, et al. 2010; Toth and Aull 2013). Finally, DSP provides an alternative to placing students in writing courses using standardized testing and test scores, which do not consistently reflect writing ability. Given that the ACT and SAT will no longer be required for admission to a UC, this model seemed most appropriate for our local campus context.

Roughly 4000 students completed DSP in Course 2 of Slug Orientation (July 6-July 16). They were provided a survey made up of three main parts: Introduction, survey, and recommendation:

- **Introduction:** Students were offered information about what DSP is, why the Writing Program uses it, the steps of the process, and basic Writing Program course information.
- **Survey:** Students were asked to review authentic Writing Program course materials and answer questions about their readiness for and needs around that material. This portion was not a writing exam, but students' responses were scored and mapped onto the student learning outcomes of Writing Program courses.

³ Subsequent to the issuance of this memo, an online version of the AWPE was developed and administered in July 2020, and all students who intended to SIR at a UC were invited--not required--to take this exam for placement purposes.

- **Recommendation:** Within a few weeks of completing the survey, students received a course recommendation, along with detailed information about the day-to-day expectations and support structures of each course. Students weighed this information and responded with their course selection. Multilingual students who placed themselves higher than the recommended course and student who selected a course more than one level higher than their placement recommendation were offered advising from Writing Program faculty to help inform their decisions.

In this model, ELWR satisfaction is determined by the course student self-select, based on their placement recommendation. For ELWR-Satisfied students who did not complete DSP, we accepted standardized test scores and credits (e.g., SAT, IB, ACT, AP credit, community college credit) or online AWPE scores (if applicable) for placement.

Results from this process--not taking into account student deferrals, summer melt, and other unknown enrollment factors--were as follows:

Course	Students
Writing 25	1%
Writing 26	3%
Writing 1E	3%
Writing 1	59%
Writing 2	34%
-----	-----
Total	100%

These results show that 34% of students will move from College 1 directly into WRIT 2, a significantly lower percentage than in previous years (for reference, roughly 65% of students place into WRIT 2 after College 1). The Writing Program Chair is collaborating with the Humanities Dean on curriculum planning for the 2020-2021 academic year in light of these placement results.

Recommendations

Since these results were not available until August, CEP has not discussed them or come up with recommendations. The incoming committee, which will also have the responsibilities hitherto assigned to the Committee on Preparatory Education, should look into this early in Fall 2020.

Budgetary Concerns

When the Academic Literacy Curriculum was reviewed by the Academic Senate, it came with a statement from the Administration that it was within the resource envelope to which the Administration had committed. In Spring 2019, the Humanities Division made the case that they were not adequately funded for the Writing Program courses in the ALC. Both CEP and the Committee on Planning and Budget were consulted on this, after which it has been pending with the Administration. (One-time supplementary funding was provided to the Humanities Division in 2019-20.) The appropriate funding for the Writing Program part of the ALC should be determined as soon as possible, and provided on a permanent basis to the Humanities Division. This is especially important in the light of the big increase in students placing into Writing 1 under Directed Self Placement, discussed in the previous section of this report. CEP recommends that the funding for these courses be based on the actual number of students enrolled in these courses, similar to the way College 1 is funded, instead, of basing it on the number of students matriculating at UCSC each year and using formulae that predate the ALC.

Respectfully submitted;

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Douglas Bonnett

Kate Edmunds

Lindsay Hinck, CCI Chair, *ex officio*

Dongwook Lee

Ronnie Lipschutz

Pradip Mascharak

Richard Montgomery

Tonya Ritola WouldGo

Tchad Sanger, University Registrar, *ex officio*

Matt Wagers

Onuttom Narayan, Chair

Joy Hagen, NSTF Representative

Manel Camps, Provost Representative