August 4, 2009

TO:    JOHN BRIGGS, DIRECTOR
       UNDERGRADUATE WRITING PROGRAM

FM:    ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE:    PROPOSAL FOR THE CREATION OF AN ALTERNATE TRACK FOR SELECTED
       ENTRY-LEVEL WRITING STUDENTS: ENGLISH 01PA

The Executive Council has approved the above proposal on behalf of the Division. It will be
included in the December 1, 2009 Agenda notice for information.

Thank you.

Cc: David Fairis
University Writing Program

July 24, 2009

Proposal for the Creation of an Alternate Track for Selected Entry-Level Writing Students: **English 01PA**

**Background:**

For many years, the Entry-Level program has provided an optional “Qualifier” track for students who enter UCR just below the passing level in their placement results. We propose the creation of **English 01PA** as a second, more practical alternative track for these students. English 01PA would be an intensive version of English 1A. Class size would be capped at 18 rather than 23. There would be mandatory tutorials. Students would also be required to enroll in the one-unit online tutorial: ENGL 5L. We anticipate that in the first year approximately 10 to 12 percent of ELWR students (approximately 200) would qualify to take this course.

**Goals:**

English 01PA is designed to serve two goals: 1) to provide an appropriate level of instruction for ELWR students, and 2) to facilitate their progress through UCR's overall writing requirement. The program would be a pilot to be evaluated at the end of three years. With Senate approval, it could be renewed.

**Proposed Change:**

The course descriptions of ENGL 01PA and ENGL 001A would be identical except for the following changes:

1. **New Course title:** ENGL 01PA

2. **Content Overlap:** Course content of ENGL 01PA would be the same as that of ENGL 001A

3. **Prerequisite:** An appropriate score on the University of California Analytical Writing Placement Examination and consent of the director of the University Writing Program. Concurrent enrollment in ENGL 005L.

4. **Credit:** Credit is awarded for only one of ENGL 01PA or ENGL 001A.

5. **Activities:** Individual Tutorial of .5 hours per week.
6. **Grading:** Students must receive a grade of “C” or better to satisfy the University of California Entry-Level Requirement and go on to ENGL 001B.

For ENGL 01PA, the University Writing Program would reduce section size to 18 students (down from the usual ENGL 1A enrollment of 23) so that instructors would have more time to interact with students and respond to their work. The writing program’s more experienced instructors would teach the sections. Trained undergraduate tutors would attend class so that their follow-up tutorial sessions could be assignment-specific, and so that tutors had the highest possible credibility with instructor and students. Students would meet with the tutor once a week for half an hour. In addition, all students would take ENGL 005L (a one-unit CAI course).

Besides accelerating selected students’ progress through the requirement, this innovation would save the campus several hundred dollars per student. (Cost per student would be around $445 [vs. $730 for ENGL 005 + ENGL 001A]. Overall program savings would be around $300 for each successful student starting a year after the institution of the program.) From a fiscal as well as an academic viewpoint, accurate placement of students in the accelerated course would be vital to ensure that failure rates remained very low.

To ensure that there is no misunderstanding about prerequisites for ENGL 001B, the following language is to be added to the course description of that course:

**Prerequisite:** A grade of “C” or better in ENGL 001A or ENGL 01PA.

**The UWP’s Implementation Guidelines**

*(For the committees’ information, these are the administrative procedures that the UWP has said it would implement with the new ENGL 01PA)*

1. **Selection of Students**

Those eligible for ENGL 01PA would be students selected from those initially placed in English 5, which normally enrolls the top 15 to 20 percent of Entry-Level students (those held for the Entry-Level Requirement prior to taking English 1A). Further enlargement of the eligibility pool would be considered if additional placement criteria were approved by the Writing Program Committee and the English Department and the Committee on Preparatory Education. As much as possible, students would be given the opportunity to choose whether or not to participate.
2. Selection of Instructors

The UWP would assign experienced instructors to teach the intensive courses.

3. Class Size

Enrollment in ENGL 01PA would be limited to 18 students.

4. Extra Assistance

a. ENGL 01PA students would be required to enroll in ENGL 005L, the one-unit CAI course that exercises their ability to use a grammar handbook and carry out basic tasks related to critical reading. Students would spend an average of two to three hours per week on the L-course assignments.

b. ENGL 01PA students would be required to work with a University Writing Program tutor for half an hour once a week. The tutors, who would be upper-division undergraduates, would be carefully-selected and trained by the UWP, and embedded in each section.

5. Provision for Students who did not Pass Intensive 1A

Since it is likely that ENGL 01PA would only be offered in the fall, students who did not pass take English 5 and then ENGL 001A.

6. Grading Standards

To ensure the consistency of grading in intensive sections, the experienced instructors teaching intensive sections would teach regular English 1A sections the same quarter. For most or all assignments, they would evaluate a mixture of intensive and non-intensive papers.

7. Student Evaluations

The Writing Program Committee, when it conducted personnel reviews for the Lecturers involved, would take account of the experimental circumstances in which students would be writing evaluations during the pilot period.

8. Evaluation of the Pilot

The Senate would look at evidence of student progress as financial savings when evaluating this pilot program.
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May 29, 2008

TO: S. AXELROD, CHAIR PREPARATORY EDUCATION
    THEDA SHAPIRO, CHAIR, COURSES
    DANIEL STRAUS, CHAIR EDUCATIONAL POLICY

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: REVISED PROPOSAL FOR AN INTENSIVE ENGLISH 1A FOR SELECTED ENTRY-LEVEL WRITING STUDENTS

Attached for your review is a proposal for an intensive English 1A track for selected Entry-Level students. It has been approved by the Writing Program Committee and the English Department.

Please review and submit your comments by June 19, 2009.

Attachments (1)
University Writing Program

May 21, 2009

TO: Tony Norman, Senate Chair

FROM: John Briggs, UWP Director

RE: Revised Proposal for an Intensive English 1A for Selected Entry-Level Writing Students

I am forwarding you the proposal for an intensive English 1A track for selected Entry-Level students. It has been approved by the Writing Program Committee and the English Department. Since the CNAS executive committee and the CHASS executive committee meet next Wednesday to consider this legislation as well as the revised WAC proposal, I am asking that you circulate this part of their agenda to them as soon as possible. (The formal proposal for a change in the ENGL 001A course description is now available for the executive committees on CRAMS.)

This proposal is designed to serve two goals: 1) to provide an appropriate level of instruction for ELWR students, and 2) to facilitate their progress through UCR’s overall writing requirement. The program would be a pilot to be evaluated at the end of three years. With Senate approval, it could be renewed.

For many years, the Entry-Level program has provided an optional “Qualifier” track for students who enter UCR just below the passing level in their placement results. We propose to open a second, more practical alternative track to serve these students. It would be called “Intensive English 1A.”

No change in the ENGL 001A course description would be necessary except for the prerequisite. The course prerequisite would add “or consent of the Director of the University Writing Program.” The guidelines for the Director’s placement of students in the intensive ENGL 001A have been developed in consultation with the Writing Program Committee, the English Department, and the Committee on Preparatory Education. They are listed in item #1 on the second page of this document.

For the ENGL 1A intensive track, the University Writing Program would reduce section size to 18 students (down from the usual ENGL 1A enrollment of 23) so that instructors would have more time to interact with students and respond to their work. The UWP’s more experienced instructors would teach the sections. Trained undergraduate tutors would attend class so that their follow-up tutorial sessions could be assignment-specific, and so that tutors had the highest possible credibility with instructor and
students. Students would meet with the tutor once a week for half an hour. In addition, all students would take ENGL 005L (a one-unit CAI course).

Besides accelerating selected students’ progress through the requirement, this innovation would save the campus several hundred dollars per student. (Cost per student would be around $445 [vs. $730 for ENGL 005 + ENGL 001A]. Overall program savings would be around $300 for each successful student starting a year after the institution of the program.) From a fiscal as well as an academic viewpoint, accurate placement of students in the accelerated course would be vital to ensure that failure rates remained very low.
June 10, 2009

TO:    ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    DANIEL STRAUS, CHAIR
       COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE:    CEP FINAL RESPONSE ON INTENSIVE ENGLISH 1A PROPOSAL

Over the past several days on E-mail, the CEP considered Dr. Briggs’s E-mail response dated June 8 to the CEP memo of June 5, 2009. We thank Dr. Briggs for the additional details provided in his response. By a unanimous vote (10 yes votes, 0 no votes) the CEP approves the proposal, with the following recommendation:

We strongly recommend that the course descriptions for ENGL 1ABC be changed to state that a grade of C or better is considered passing and is required to fulfill the ENGL 1ABC graduation requirement. This change in the course descriptions should be made by the end of the 2009-2010 academic year.

cc:    John Briggs, Director, University Writing Program
       David Fairris, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
       Theda Shapiro, Chair, Courses Committee
June 5, 2009

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: DANIEL STRAUS, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: INTENSIVE ENGLISH 1A PROPOSAL

The CEP discussed the Revised Proposal for an Intensive English 1A in its June 3, 2009 meeting. In principle, this seems to be a reasonable idea. However, the committee had several comments and questions that should be addressed before the proposal is approved.

1. The ENGL 1A (intensive) grade required for completion of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) needs to be defined. Will this grade be C or better, as in ENGL 5? If so, there will be a problem for students who receive a C-. This grade, as well as a D grade, is a passing grade for ENGL 1A and would normally allow a student to take ENGL 1B next. Furthermore, students are not usually permitted to repeat a course for which they have already received a C-. If the grade required for completion of the ELWR is higher than the grade required to pass ENGL 1A, the exact series of courses to be taken by students with grades between F and the pass line for ELWR needs to be explicitly stated.

2. How many students are expected to enroll in the intensive ENGL 1A?

3. The procedures to be used for recruiting and training the undergraduate tutors should be stated. We assume that the tutors will be paid. Is this correct?

4. Please show how the cost figures on page 2 were generated. Did the cost calculation include the expense of training and paying the undergraduate tutors, and the cost of ENGL 5? 

5. The program is proposed as a three year pilot. The CEP requests a report after the first year with an assessment of results and problems encountered. It should be possible after one year to see whether the program is working, and if not, problems will have to be remedied before the second year.

cc: John Briggs, Director, University Writing Program
David Fairris, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
June 4, 2009

TO:    A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
       RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:    S. G. AXELROD, CHAIR
       PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE:    PROPOSAL FOR AN INTENSIVE ENGLISH 1A TRACK FOR SELECTED
       ENTRY LEVEL STUDENTS

At its June 4 meeting, the Committee on Preparatory Education added two friendly
amendments to the proposal for an Intensive English 1A track for selected ELWR
students and then passed the proposal unanimously (John Briggs abstaining, though
enthusiastically supportive).

The first amendment was to add a sentence to the end of section 5:

A grade of C in Intensive 1A or in an ELWR course is required for passage of the entry-
level writing requirement.

The second amendment was a new section 8:

8. Monitoring the Program

Monitoring student progress as well as fiscal consequences of this program will be the
basis for the Senate review.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
June 22, 2009

TO:    A. W. Norman, Chair
       Riverside Division of the
       Academic Senate

FR:    Theda Shapiro, Chair
       Committee on Courses

RE:    Proposal for an intensive English 1A track for
       selected entry level students

At its meeting on June 5th, the Committee on Courses considered the above-referenced proposal, along with the friendly amendments added to the proposal by the Committee on Preparatory Education.

Our committee expressed its unanimous in principle approval of the proposal as amended. We also embraced the proviso stated by the Committee on Educational Policy, which advised the University Writing Program (UWP) to submit changes to ENGL 1A, 1B, and 1C which would stipulate that students must receive a grade of "C" in each of these courses in order to satisfy the University writing requirement.

However, while agreeing entirely with the philosophy of the proposal, our committee did not approve the requested changes to ENGL 1A, but rather proposed to UWP that they create a new course (currently titled ENGL 1PA) to be used to enroll those students held for EWLR who will receive permission to follow the new intensive ENGL 1A track. There are several reasons for this, including the importance of avoiding duplication of credit for any students who do not achieve a "C" grade in the new intensive course; the necessity for computer-tracking of the smaller sizes of the sections to be taken by these students; the need to have explicit on the course approval the requirement that this cohort of students be enrolled concurrently in ENGL 5L and attend tutoring sessions; and other, similar technical matters. To accommodate this new course, the present ENGL 1A and 1B also needed to be submitted for changes to prerequisite and credit statements. We have been working very closely with UWP on these course proposals, which are currently back in the approval process with the CHASS Executive Committee and our committee.

Please don't hesitate to ask if the above is not clear or you have any other questions.
July 28, 2009

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: THEDA SHAPIRO, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON COURSES

RE: RESPONSES TO COMMITTEE REPORTS ON INTENSIVE 1A
    (ENGLISH 01PA)

Professor Briggs has indeed responded adequately to the questions and comments addressed by the Committee on Courses. We have approved the new course, ENGL001PA, and we agree with the changes of prerequisites that we suggested, along with UCEP. As far as we are concerned we hope the Senate will approve the proposed changes.