Present: Dana Ferris, Chair (UCD), Robin Scarcella (UCI) (telephone), Margi Wald (UCB), Kelly Crosby (UCD), Kimberly Turner (UCR) (telephone), Jan Frodesen (UCSB), Belinda Braunstein (UCM), Anne Zanzucchi (UCM, Director, Merritt Writing Program), Kimberly Helmer (UCSC) (telephone), Holly Bauer (UCSD), George Gadda (Consultant, AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader) (telephone), and Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Ferris welcomed members to the EMS Advisory Group to the meeting and members introduced themselves and noted their responsibilities at their campuses.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The agenda was approved.

III. Campus Reports

Each Advisory Group member was given 10 minutes to provide a campus report briefly highlighting achievements, challenges and areas of focus.

UCB: The campus offers a six unit course that fulfills both the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and the first half of reading and composition. There are multi-lingual student writer designated sections but these are self-selected. This year, Jane Stanley retired and a search for a new director is underway. The interim director initiated a review of the portfolio process for the college writing R1a class. In the past, students could receive an in progress grade to students but this is no longer an option. The program is thinking about how to make the class more manageable for students, issues related to portfolios, and making a stretch version of the course. The enrollment in the R1a course is continuing to decline which may be related to changes in admission or because students are taking classes to satisfy reading and composition elsewhere because of the cost at UCB.

Last year, the Student Learning Center did not have the resources to provide 1:1 weekly tutoring so the writing program created an in-house tutoring program that helps fill in the gaps. Connections were made with different campus groups to work with students at UCB through the Education Abroad Program (EAP). For example, the Sociology Department provided funding to support additional sections for this department’s EAP students. With an interim dean and interim director, the program’s future is a concern. UCB has a $150M annual deficit so the program’s budget situation is uncertain. All part-time staff and collateral duties have been eliminated so that everyone is completed focused on teaching.

UCD: The program is now ending its third year of offering a three-course English as a Second Language (ESL) sequence. Issues include fluctuating enrollment and working on the curriculum so that it articulates well. Two assistant director positions were created to help with conducting meeting, norming portfolios, and curriculum articulation. Some people in the program collaborated to publish two course readers to provide materials that are consistent across sections while giving the instructors flexibility with the assignments. Students responded well to this theme based instruction, which the program is attempting to make more concrete and broadly accessible.
At Davis, multiple groups are involved with services for international students. There are questions about which courses, including graduate courses, will be in the writing program or be moved to other departments. The growing numbers of multilingual transfer students, including international transfer students, have increased the demand for courses needed in preparation for upper division work. The program still outsources the ELWR course and it was noted that a disproportionate number of multilingual students are in this course. Course descriptions for a series have been updated and these courses will be converted from pass/no pass into letter graded courses.

**UCI:** The numbers of students have increased and along with this has been the increased hiring of instructors. The program anticipates hiring fifty academic English instructors in the fall, thirty or more of whom will be new. Enrollment in 2010 was 350 and this fall the program expects to serve over two thousand. Two large tutorial programs are serving about four hundred graduate and undergraduate students. More highly qualified lecturers will be hired, the program will have six academic coordinators in the fall, and the program’s infrastructure including staff has been enhanced. Each writing course has a lab associated with them providing extra support to students.

Hiring lecturers is a concern at this campus. Complicated personnel issues and enrollment make it difficult to hire sufficient full time instructors and salaries for lecturers are really low. The unit was asked to provide support for faculty and the program researched faculty and students to identify supports that could help international students. The gaps in the amount of support across campus for international students and recognition of their contributions to the campus and any needs they might have in terms of instruction.

**UCM:** Compared to other UC campuses, Merced has very few international students. However, 70% of the students speak a language other than English at home, either with English or only another language. Serving these students is the biggest challenge for the program. It is likely that a large proportion of these students will need to satisfy Entry Level Writing at the campus. Over the past several years the importance of serving these students has been under discussion with campus administration and the divisional Senate has expressed support. There is greater understanding of why the program needs to be on campus and this year a petition process will be implemented to make sure that students who do not complete ELWR for any reason during a year are given an opportunity for review by the Senate and by the Writing Program. This has helped get the program more established.

A pilot project for a Writing Center, involving a number of campus partners and being run through the library, focuses on research writing. It currently employees ten undergraduate students and there is a proposal to institutionalize it. The library has included the Writing Center in its 2020 plan. The needs of graduate students have been discussed with the graduate division. The campus also does not have a formal way for students to get feedback on their writing. Different strategies have been tried but a more sustained and involved is needed. One goal is to make the proposal for the Writing Center comprehensive and campus oriented in terms of serving different types of student populations.

At Merced, workshops for faculty on best practices for working with first generation students, including those with language needs, have not been well attended. The Writing Program is fiscally located in undergraduate education and academically located in a Humanities unit and this split can be challenging. As the campus has grown, this structure has become more of a barrier when it comes to how the program handles different things, such as engaging graduate students as instructors of General Education in writing. It is hoped that changes in the organization of the program will allow it to become more comprehensive.

**UCR:** A good number of students do no pass the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) and take the ELWR classes. About 1300 students took the main ELWR class. Limited space is available in the new
Basic Writing 1 and 2 courses and most of the students in these classes are international students. These courses are designed to provide the extra support international students need including help with acclimating to American university life. The program continues to refine the curriculum and finding new materials. Deciding where to place students can be a challenge for the program. The program has found that students have been placed into English 4 class that have English as a Second Language problems that were not seen on the AWPE or on the alternative exam administered to international students. The teachers of the English 4 classes often lack the experience to deal with problems faced by multilingual students.

The program seems to be well supported. The funding has been provided to allow the program to teach all of the Basic Writing 3 and English 4 courses, and in anticipation of freshman enrollment increasing, new full time lecturers have been hired. The focus in the short term will be on training the new teachers. The program is attempting to provide opportunities for students to practice speaking English more outside of the classroom.

UCSD: A new basic writing curriculum was piloted this year. The instructors who teach basic writing have been contracted to a local community college which was directed by a UCSD employee. The students were under both sets of campus policies. In various reviews, the program was deemed to be a big problem. The program used an exit exam and there were issues with the design, scoring and monitoring. In the 2014-15 academic year, a new set of course objectives and curriculum was designed and an interim director of basic writing was hired. The curriculum redesign included a portfolio exit exam. UCSD has been in the process of hiring about twenty instructors in basic writing so starting in the fall, all of the teachers will be Unit 18 lecturers. A search for a new director has been completed.

The campus has high numbers of international students, some of whom need significant language support even though they do not have to pass the AWPE. Some of these students know they would like additional support but they will have to opt into the course offering more basic instruction. A drawback from the students’ perspective is that this course does not fulfill requirements. International graduate students who need different types of language help is a growing population at San Diego but the program has seen a noticeable drop in the enrollment of international students in special summer programs. These students are choosing or being advised starting in high school to take content courses in their major over English courses.

UCSB: The program was able to accommodate all of the international students this year unlike last year. The undergraduate courses are serving international students almost exclusively, the majority of whom are Chinese. The focus has been on finding qualified instructors and this is a significant challenge. The campus has the requirement that instructors must have experience teaching college composition and it is not feasible to have this job requirement for everyone. The administration’s support for the Writing and EMS programs is stable. The Campus Learning Assistance Center dedicated two tutors to the program for the upper level courses.

The program received funding from the graduate division for a pilot program for an intensive International Teaching Assistant program and stipends were provided to incoming doctoral students to participate in the program and funds were used to hire graduate students to mentor them. The program has worked on curriculum development. There has been an effort to make assignments more consistent within the levels. One goal is to increase collaboration. The program was told to expect five hundred Chinese students in the fall for testing which is a significant burden.

UCSC: All students take the AWPE and, in the past, no matter the test score, all students were placed into an ELWR section for basic writing. The program found that this set up was not working and last year, a curriculum was designed and piloted specifically for F-1 Visa holders. Students are first placed a content-
based courses with a focus on writing. Five new faculty members were hired to teach these courses. An assessment found that students did very well so the pilot will be institutionalized. The program will continue to think about the best ways to place students.

IV. Challenges and Problems

Advisory Group members have the opportunity to discuss issues or challenges that were mentioned during the campus reports. Issues related to hiring include finding more qualified instructors as programs grow, the need to hire more instructors for the fall than in the spring, and how to train new hires. Placement is an ongoing issue and members may be able to learn from one another about how this is handled. Programs have also developed new curriculum. One question is how the centralization of curriculum is achieved while continuing to respect people as professionals but still creating consistency in the approach. Leadership challenges were also mentioned.

Discussion: There is an expectation that Teaching Assistants (TAs) will be closely supervised. The idea was that individuals hired as Unit 18 lecturers should come in prepared. The UCSB representative tries to visit each of the instructors’ classrooms at least once per year. When Chair Ferris started at UCD, all of the TAs were graduate students. The UCSB representative would like to hear about ways to increase uniformity. The Academic Coordinators from UCI provided UCD with materials which were very helpful. UCD and UCSB do not have big academic coordinator infrastructures at their campuses.

The UCM writing program partnered with the library on a project to create connections between information literacy and writing. The writing instructors have a variety of different strategies and this has demonstrated the need for a flexible model. One idea is to create a bank of resources to share and members agreed that the group should create this.

There have been multiple complaints at UCSB about international students who are plagiarizing. A group of students in one history course plagiarized and the representative will follow up with the instructor of that course to learn the details. At UCD there are discussions raising awareness about plagiarizing. The University should realize that it is creating conditions that encourage students to cut corners. UCSD has a significant problem with students paying for others to write their essays. The time to degree for international students is under four years and one reason for this is international students want to avoid paying the higher non-resident tuition any longer than necessary. Students are likely to plagiarize if they are not engaged in the work they are doing or if the purpose is not clear.

It was suggested that the writing programs could partner with the campus Centers for Teaching Excellence to develop a short workshop series on supporting international students or students who speak another language. Non-ladder and ladder rank faculty have attended UCM workshops. Workshops should be designed specifically for lecturers. One suggestion is to find the people on campuses who are coordinating the TAs to help with their training since the TAs do so much of the work in the writing programs.

Hiring is a challenge for the programs as they grow and because there is a need for instructors with specialized preparation. Programs have to be careful about hiring a person repeatedly because it sets up an expectation of permanent employment in the future and causes a problem with the six year review. At UCD there is difficulty with getting the accurate enrollment numbers so instructors need to be hired at the last minute. At one campus, there is the general attitude that anyone can teach writing and writing programs are advised to hire graduate students. UCSB makes an effort to get people hired at half time so they are eligible for benefits. Questions include what specialization or skill levels are needed to teach in these programs and what happens if a program cannot find individuals who possess the desired expertise. There is a big difference between teaching at an Intensive English Program and in one of the programs for
multilingual students. UCM used contacted local chairs to find candidates to teach in the writing program and this increased the relevancy of the applications. This campus has guaranteed summer teaching to individuals who have relocated to the Merced area.

Several program representatives described challenges related to placement. UCD is the only campus that administers a campus-specific placement exam during the summer to international students while they are still overseas. The UCD English Language Placement Exam (ELPE) is taken by international students who have not taken the AWPE as well as domestic multilingual students who receive the e-designation when they failed the AWPE. Concerns have been expressed about security but the program decided to implement the ELPE anyway. Eleven hundred students took the ELPE last year and just over twenty students were replaced. Students at UCD also complete a directed self-placement survey which Chair Ferris will share with the Group. Over the last two years, 20% fell at the lowest level, 50% at the middle level and about 30% at the highest level. The students who take ELPE are individuals who did not take the AWPE or fulfill the ELWR in other ways. This is done utilizing the Canvas quiz function.

V. Analytical Writing Placement Exam

- George Gadda, AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader

Consultant Gadda introduced himself to the Advisory Group and noted that he just retired from UCLA after 35 years. Since the AWPE was proposed, Consultant Gadda has chaired the AWPE Committee. For this year’s reader, there was concern because of the much larger number of California admits. The May exam is only for California residents and it was not clear what the total number would actually be. The total was about 16,200 and the program was staffed to deal with this number of people.

Discussion: Members remarked that there are growing numbers of international students being brought by their parents to the U.S. to study here. The scores will be sent to the campuses on June 14th. Some of the international students testing out of ELWR because of SAT scores seem to actually need and want more writing assistance. But they are not eligible to take certain courses because they have satisfied the ELWR. The Group may consider suggesting that campuses give international students some type of placement examination. Consultant Gadda described the main changes being made to the SAT and reported that next year UCOPE will have to decide on how to use the new SAT essay or the new multiple choice reading and writing portion of the exam. The Advisory Group should share any concerns with UCOPE about ways that international students seem to bypass entry level writing.

Consultant Gadda proposed that the Advisory Group could suggest studies that UC might conduct on international students. The consultant reminded the members about the Advisory Group’s report to UCOPE on ESL at UC from 1989. In light of the new populations of students at UC, it might be timely to create a new version of this report. The Advisory Group could suggest to UCOPE studies that UC might conduct on international students. The report could look at issues such as the need for academic language once students arrive at a UC campus or the persistence and success of this population on a systemwide level. It was noted that some UC campuses will not want to send a negative message to the international students that they have to improve certain skills but this may be less of a concern if UCOP is in charge of the studies. Members discussed the need to highlight the benefits of diversity in order to improve opinions of faculty, staff, TAs, and other undergraduate students towards international students.

VI. The Future of the EMS Advisory Group

Chair Ferris indicated that there are issues related to representation that the Advisory Group needs to discuss. Members have retired or left the Advisory Group for other reasons in recent years and questions include what the criteria for members should be, who is the appropriate campus representative, who appoints members, and how to determine who can join as a guest. Because of the work they perform, the
Advisory Group meeting may be relevant to multiple people at a campus but this does not automatically mean that they should be invited to attend. The Advisory Group chair should be notified about proposed new members and UCOPE should be asked to approve the final roster.

If a member needs to send an alternate, the Group’s chair should be notified so the substitute can be approved. In the case where a substitute needs to attend, the representative will remain responsible for preparing the campus report before the meeting. Chair Ferris is willing to be flexible for situations involving one-time coverage especially at the last minute.

Chair Ferris asked the Group to consider the charge of this group and to give some thought to the initiatives that the Advisory Group should spend time on in the next few years. In the past, the purpose of the meetings has been a mix of sharing information and discussing policy.

**Discussion:** One of the long-term members of the Advisory Group pointed out that each campus has just one representative on UCOPE and the Advisory Group should follow this structure. Funding to reimburse participants for travel from UCOP or the campuses is an issue. The majority of the Advisory Group members are lecturers and the Senate does not reimburse these members for their travel. The analyst suggested that videoconferencing would allow for more individuals from each campus to participate or for the Advisory Group to have an additional meeting. Chair Ferris commented that having a large number of participants would make the meeting more difficult to manage.

The field of writing is lecturer-intensive, and the necessary resources should be made available even for Unit 18 lecturers so that experts in the field can attend this meeting. Non-Senate faculty do not have incidental accounts. Advisory Group members should provide a report to their programs on the Group’s activities. Chair Ferris indicated that she is willing to ask about reimbursement for non-Senate members. Departments could be encouraged to invest in the Advisory Group, especially in light of the growth in international students. The Group could make its case to UCOPE which would in turn make recommendations to the Academic Senate.

Reportedly at UCR, attending the EMS Advisory Group meeting is included in the ESL coordinator’s job description and the individual is given course releases but it is possible that the person in this position could change from year to year. In this case, the UCR representative would notify the Advisory Group’s chair about the new coordinator. The analyst mentioned that some of the campuses have Preparatory Education committees which could be involved with identifying new members for the Advisory Group. The comment was made that members of the Advisory Group do not know who is on the campus Preparatory Education committees.

Members may want to consider whether they are the best representatives from their campus for the Advisory Group. Politically, the time may be right for the Advisory Group to request more funding to attend meetings like this one or for resources for services to the growing populations of international students and other students whose first language is not English. The Advisory Group meeting is the one meeting focused on non-English speakers and it brings together the individuals working in this field. It was suggested that the Advisory Group could request a slush fund to cover different expenses such as for conducting systemwide studies or for attending meetings. In the past, UCOPE’s chair attended the Advisory Group meeting.

If the Advisory Group writes a report, it would be submitted to UCOPE for endorsement at least or with a request to be forwarded to the Academic Council and even to President Napolitano. It was noted that UCOPE’s membership changes may change every year and that a good part of their meetings is focused on educating the members about the AWPE. The UCOPE bylaw states that it shall “advise the President
and appropriate agencies of the Senate on matters relating to preparatory and remedial education, including the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds.”

Advising on policy continues to be extremely important, but the Advisory Group is well-positioned to create a resource bank for individuals in this field. The Advisory Group can play an important role in raising faculty awareness of the issues. One caution about the collecting resources to share is that copyright issues must be considered and any subcommittee that works on this would need to be mindful of any restrictions. A site for the teacher development materials has been requested.

Some members might want to have a meeting after the TESOL conference in November and there is also a Council of Writing Program Directors in October in Santa Barbara. Advisory Group members who plan to attend these meetings could get together at these meetings for brief work sessions. The analyst commented that the chair of UCOPE is a member of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates which includes representatives from the UC, California Community College and the California State University systems and the issues related to students with language needs could be highlighted in this arena.

The use of standardized admissions test scores to satisfy the ELWR is currently an important policy issue. A more difficult question is whether students should be allowed to get out of first year GE writing based on their Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate exam scores. Funding would need to be available to add the sections that would be needed if students were not allowed to satisfy these courses. The members agreed about the need to assess the readiness of international students including admissions criteria, persistence and success compared to local students and needs for academic language.

The Advisory Group could also look at the undocumented Dream Act students who have needs similar to students who speak English as a Second Language. The undocumented students have often attended underfunded inner-city public schools and may not have access to academic literacy support they needed. Members agreed to look at the funding President Napolitano just announced for support services for Dream Act students. There is a desire for data, in particular on the current numbers of “parachute” students. The data collected by the Advisory Group may be of interest to members of UCOPE.

The analyst suggested sharing the list of short and long term action items with UCOPE. The UCD, UCI and UCR representatives offered to help with professional development materials and the UCB representative will help with Canvas. The UCSB representative will organize information about hiring and other members will send her examples of materials used. The Advisory Group may want to notify UCOPE about past reports that the group is interested in updating which is one way to bring attention the issues related to multilingual students. All of the members will investigate which campus entities received funding from the president to serve undocumented students. The Group aimed to have a draft memo for UCOPE in August so that UCOPE’s chair can share the highlights with the September retreat that will be attended by other systemwide committee chair and vice chairs. The Canvas site will be set up by August 1st.

VII. Possible Dates for the 2017 Advisory Group Meeting

Discussion: Members discussed the possible meeting date for 2017. The UCOPE meetings will be on January 27th and April 28th. The EMS Advisory Group agreed on April 14, 2017.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Dana Ferris