

**COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DIVISION
NOVEMBER 30, 2021**

To be received and placed on file:

The Committee on Preparatory Education met four times during the 2020-2021 academic year.

The Riverside Division of the Committee on Preparatory Education was represented on the Universitywide Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) by the Committee Chair Jingsong Zhang. The Committee was updated by Professor Zhang at each meeting about issues under discussion at the Systemwide level.

The Committee undertook its regular review of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) program. The Associate Director of the University Writing Program and ex officio member of the Committee, Paul Beehler, provided the Committee with an overview of the program and presented a report documenting the outcomes of the program for the 2019-2020 academic year. The report documented that 61% of entering freshmen at UCR had satisfied the ELWR before registering as full-time students. The remaining 39% of entering freshmen placed in entry-level writing courses and the great majority made good progress once they arrived at UCR. The Committee voted to approve the report and it was reported on the December 1, 2020, Division meeting agenda.

The Committee reviewed the amended proposal to modify the UCR Comprehensive Review model for undergraduate admissions. Members responded with the following: The proposal was a response to a court case, so altering UCR's procedure to be test-blind for this upcoming admissions cycle makes sense. We have no choice but to conform the decision to the state supreme court ruling. However, there are some concerns about the proposed procedures, e.g., the weights for each admission criteria in Table 1 for the "Without" option. Members believe that the GPA is weighted too high (0.8 or 80%). The text of the IR report states that GPA has a maximum prediction at about 0.7 (see page 6, paragraph 3). Besides that, a problem with weighting GPA too high is that it will likely promote grade inflation. Some members would like to down weight GPA to 0.7. That is still 40% higher than in the past (i.e., 0.7 vs. 0.5 in the past; $7/5 = 1.4$; whereas the report is proposing to increase the weight of GPA by 60% from 0.5 to 0.8).

The Committee reviewed the amended Proposal 2020-21 Curtailment Program. Members responded with the following: The committee noted that in order to "curtail" staff wages and workdays it requests a commensurate adjustment to deadlines, paperwork, and all the other support that will impact students, especially to all the procedures for preparing and admitting students. If staff take five unpaid days without some leniency given to the deadlines and amounts of work they will actually administer, then the curtailment will negatively affect students and prospective students. The curtailments need a supporting context. The committee also noted that any forthcoming curtailments for faculty be similarly contextualized. If waged staff are being asked to stop working for five days, then the same principle should be applied to faculty. Since faculty are not typically able to simply stop ongoing research, teaching, and service obligations, those who propose these curtailments should lessen faculty responsibilities, the expectations for their productivity, and so on, commensurate with any proposed curtailments. Curtailment implies that there will be a reduction in responsibilities or workload. It is unclear how that will work for faculty. The proposal does not seem open to a curtailment of teaching responsibilities or even University service, so it seems that the faculty can only curtail their research. Yet, that could have negative consequences to faculty's career progress. This proposal needs further development. The proposal is vague. Its aim is to allow campuses to save money through salary savings, but significant details are lacking. Will 11-month faculty be permitted to use their vacation days while 9-month faculty, with no vacation, have no option but unpaid days? How would the accounting be

handled? What would the estimated savings be? Would this impact quarter system campuses differently than the semester system campus, with our shorter winter break?

“For academic-year faculty, the program would be implemented as an equivalent reduction in salary (based on the salary tiers established under the program) but would not result in additional paid or unpaid time off.” Can academic-year faculty use their research grants to pay the 5-day curtailment or compensate the portion of salary loss/reduction? Please consider that academic faculty’s job function in research/teaching/service never stops with or without curtailment. If the curtailment does not reduce faculty teaching/service, it essentially asks to jeopardize faculty research programs and student training/mentoring or keep working without pay.

What does it mean “based on salary tiers”? The same percentage of cut for everyone or different percentage for each person? How is that determined to ensure transparency, fairness, and accommodation of family needs of disadvantaged/vulnerable faculty groups?

The committee was also concerned that a fundamental reason underlying the financial distress of UCR is the inequitable distribution of money to campuses by UCOP. Our campus would be more likely than other campuses to need to recoup salary savings from personnel. One of the impacts will be to further exacerbate the salary inequities between our campus and others, not to mention the impact on our students.

The Committee reviewed the Committee on Faculty Welfare Campus Climate Survey Report and the committee feels in general that the climate survey shows to various extents that there are problems and concerns in leadership, equity, and collegiality on campus. The Academic Senate should take the survey seriously. The repeated concerns could be followed up with more focused study and should be pursued at. There are also comments on how to better understand and interpret the survey data aggregated across many departments and colleges and that it would be more useful if the data/feedback are grouped by each college, etc.

The Committee reviewed the President's Job Protection Program and offered the following comments: 1) The proposal to limit layoffs to a temporary status is sensible, as does the desire to avoid disruptions in retirement service credit, etc. 2) Some parts of the memo need clarification. For example, what the exact breakdown of the salary bands will be. Also, layoffs are presented as a possibility and not a certainty, another important detail that could help with the evaluation of the plan. Is there any idea of where these layoffs would be concentrated? Finally, there is a line in the executive summary from the Board of Regents that says eligible represented employees are subject to collective bargaining requirements. Will represented employees be exempt from this plan? This final piece of information would also be helpful when considering the plan.

The Committee reviewed the Campus Safety Task Force Report and offered the following comments: Although this review item is not directly in the purview of the committee, the committee feels it needs to respond as it concerns with preparing the students’ transition to UCR campus. The nine recommendations in the report are reasonable and should move forward. Additionally, some members question the membership of the task force (e.g., having the Police Chief on the task force) and other members note that while policing practices are important, there should be a larger plan to improve campus climate for and increase enrollment of African American students.

The Committee reviewed the Draft Strategic Plan and offered the following comments: 1) pp. 8-9: "Become a Nationally Recognized Model for Inclusive Excellence in Graduate Education": this requires adequately funding graduate programs to make us competitive with other UCs, state R1s, and Ivy League programs. Where will the money for this come from? 2) pp. 11-12: "Leverage Technology to Increase

Educational Access": the first item on this agenda is "expanding high-quality online instruction." The concern is that this is really an effort to replace f2f instruction with online, which is cheaper, and less effective. It actually runs counter to the previous imperative of building campus community by "making our large campus feel intimate and personal." How will that be achieved if resources flow away from physical classrooms to online instruction? 3) p. 16: "Provide Leadership on Pressing Societal Issues": one of these is "racial justice." This needs to be related to the task force on campus safety. It also needs to be related to the previous goal, "Make Campus-Community Boundaries More Permeable." 4) p. 18-19: all of the budget items underneath "sustainably pursuing our goals" are a variety of streamlining existing systems, but they do not address chronic understaffing and underfunding. If UCR has a hope of realizing the grand dreams outlined in this document, it needs to change the UC governance structure whereby the wealthier campuses vote to withhold adequate resources from UCR and from UCM, the campuses that serve BIPOC. 5) p. 20: "Ensuring Accountability": how are we going to hold the system-level funding accountable to us -- our students, staff, and faculty? That is missing from this document.

The Committee reviewed the Changes to College Board AP Exam Credit - Env Sci and requested a more detailed departmental justification for the change. Please provide a substantive explanation for why the change is needed, especially because the department vote was 9 for and 8 against. The committee would like to know the rationale for altering the AP score from a 3 to 4,5 for credit. Has ENSC run a study that revealed a need for such a change? Has ENSC faculty raised concerns about student preparation among the student population that received a 3 on the College Board AP Exam for Environmental Science? More information would be helpful in making an informed and reliable recommendation.

The Committee reviewed and supported the Proposed Changes to the College Board Advanced Placement Examination Credit for Statistics.

The Committee reviewed the Proposal: Renewal of Partnership Agreement between UCR & RUSD regarding Riverside STEM Academy (RSA) and generally supported the STEM Academy partnership renewal agreement with RUSD. There are some questions about the details. (1) Why only some of the colleges are participating? Why would the School of Public Policy not participate for example? (2) When RUSD or RSA is promised access, does that mean for free, or will RSA be expected to pay the fees for rooms on campus? The language for access to large classrooms include "when available." (3) Will teachers or the district be paying for the involvement of their teachers in the various programming that UCR is promising to make available for them? (4) When select University personnel guide the development of the RSA course offerings and classroom enrichment activities, will RSA be compensating them for their time? Will this be voluntary on the part of the University personnel or an expected part of their university responsibilities? 5) Shouldn't the University be partnering more broadly with RUSD to help improve their teacher training and programs, rather than just with one school within the system? (6) Regarding the insurance, will the general liability also cover medical?

Jingsong Zhang, Chair & UCOPE Rep.
Po-ning Chen
Huinan Liu
Gregory Palardy
Susan Zeiger
Alicia Arrizón, Ex Officio
Paul Beehler, Ex Officio
Connie Nugent, Ex Officio
Marko Princevac, Ex Officio
Sheldon Tan, Ex Officio
Lina Nguy, ASUCR Rep.