

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

Notice of Meeting**Friday, April 26, 2013****10:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.****UCOP, 1111 Franklin Street, Oakland, CA -- Room 5320****Primary Dial-In: 1-866-740-1260 Passcode: 9879483****AGENDA**

Action	Item	Enclosures
Information 10:00-10:15	I. Chair's Announcements/Updates – <i>Chair Jonathan Alexander</i>	
Action 10:15-10:20	II. Consent Calendar A. Approval of the Draft Minutes from the January 18, 2013 Meeting B. Approval of the Agenda	1 (pp. 1-5)
	<u>ACTION REQUESTED:</u> Approve the draft minutes and agenda.	
Action 10:20- 12:15	III. AWPE Scoring/Norming – <i>George Gadda, UCLA Writing Program</i> <i>AWPE Committee Chair George Gadda will continue the discussion from the last meeting with a focus on sample responses and scoring.</i>	Enclosures sent separately via US Mail
	<u>ACTION REQUESTED:</u> Committee members will select scores for the sample essays provided for the meeting.	
Discussion 12:15- 12:30	IV. AWPE Exam in China – Update – <i>Chair Alexander and Members</i> <i>Discuss the advisability of separate placement procedures for international, non-native English speakers. Continue the discussion whether the University should offer alternative arrangements for international students to take the AWPE (or an alternative exam) in their own countries before they matriculate.</i>	
Working Lunch 12:30-1:15	V. Consultation with UCOP and Academic Senate Leadership <i>Robert Powell, Academic Council Chair</i> <i>William Jacob, Academic Council Vice Chair</i> <i>Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions</i> <i>Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director</i>	

**Information/
Discussion
1:15- 1:45**

- VI. ESL Advisory Group Update –**
Robin Scarcella, ESL Advisory Group Chair and Members
ESL Advisory Group Chair Robin Scarcella will make a presentation about the progress of the Group. Members will report on how each campus is working with its ESL/ELL issues.

**Action
1:45-2:15**

- VII. ESL Whitepaper/International Student Enrollment –**
Chair Alexander
Discuss if UCOPE should revise its previous ESL white paper to reflect the current needs of ESL/ELL units.

**2
(pp. 6-11)**

**Action
2:15-2:45**

- VIII. Systemwide Math Diagnostic Test - Chair Alexander**
Continue discussion of the value of a possible systemwide Math Diagnostic Test in the context of comments received from math department vice chairs for undergraduate instruction. Members will decide whether to prepare a formal written proposal.

ACTION REQUESTED: Determine next steps.

**Discussion
2:45- 3:00**

- IX. Discussion of Online Writing Courses –**
Updates from the Members

**Discussion
3:00-3:15**

- X. UCOP Website Revamping - Chair Alexander and Members**
Members will discuss the impact of the redesigned UCOP web site and determine whether to submit comments to UCOP.

ACTION REQUESTED: Determine next steps.

**Discussion
3:15-3:30**

- XI. Discussion of Standardization of AP Credit Systemwide –**
Chair Alexander and Members
Continue discussion from last meeting regarding the possible standardization of AP Credit application systemwide.

**Information
3:30-4:00**

- XII. Campus Reports and Information - Members**

Agenda Enclosures:

1. Minutes of January 18, 2013
2. ESL White Paper from 2011

Important Meeting Information

Location: The April 18 meeting will convene in Room 5320 at the UC Office of the President in downtown Oakland. UCOP is located at 1111 Franklin Street, between 11th and 12th Streets. Upon arrival, please check in at the security desk where you will be issued a visitor badge. Online directions and a map are available at: <http://www.ucop.edu/services/directions-franklin.html>.

If you are arriving by way of the Oakland airport, you may taxi or BART to the UCOP building. For BART, purchase an AirBART shuttle ticket from the ticket machines located at terminal exits. The shuttle will take you to the Coliseum BART station. From there take a Richmond-bound train and exit at the 12th Street/Oakland City Center Station.

Parking: Parking is available at 989 Franklin Street for \$8/day if you park before 10 AM. Visitor parking is also available at UCOP on the 12th Street side of the building for \$11/day if you enter the parking structure before 9:00a.m. Daily parking is also available at a number of lots in the building vicinity.

Travel Regs: Detailed travel information (booking travel and receiving reimbursements) is available online at:

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/>

Please submit completed and signed travel voucher with original receipts within 21 days after the meeting to:

**Business Resource Center - Team Blue
University of California Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street 9th floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200**

Account/Fund Number: M-430384-69085-03

This agenda may contain confidential and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review or distribution by others is strictly prohibited.

UCOPE **DRAFT** meeting minutes– January 18, 2013

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

DRAFT Meeting Minutes – January 18, 2013

Present: Jonathan Alexander (Chair), Frank Ross (Vice Chair), Marcial Gonzalez (UCB), Julia Menard-Warwick (UCD), Caroline Streeter (UCLA), Suzanne Sindi (UCM), David Glidden (UCR), Bonnie Halpern-Felsher (UCSF), Linda Adler-Kassner (UCSB), David Smith (UCSC), William Jacob (Ex Officio – Council Vice Chair), Jacob Ryan Gutierrez (Student Representative – UCM), Eric Zarate (Committee Analyst), George Gadda (Consultant UCLA), Judy Sakaki (Vice President), Julie Lind (Analyst), Martha Winnacker (Executive Director), Michael Treviño (Director of Undergraduate Admissions)

I. Chair's Report/Announcements

Chair Alexander had no announcements for the committee.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the Agenda

ACTION: The agenda was approved as noticed.

III. Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Review and Selection of Essay Prompts

ISSUE: Professor Gadda provided the committee with background regarding the undergraduate writing requirement. Most students satisfy that requirement through UC's Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE). The number of students tested each year peaked five to six years ago, but it has held steady at approximately 15,600 for the past few years.

Professor Gadda said that the typical exam development process involves a small group of ESL and writing faculty sifting through suggested reading passages and then selecting the most promising to send to Professor Gadda as chair of AWPE committee. Professor Gadda then makes the final selection and editing of these passages, sending the results to a fairness reviewer provided through a contractor. However, said Professor Gadda, the past three years have been atypical. Because of budget constraints, the test devotement group has not looked for new passages; instead it has looked at previous submissions that seemed promising.

Professor Gadda explained that the committee would review the potential exams at this meeting to make the final choice for the exam prompt. The committee would look though the exercises, take time to review the passage and topic, discuss them, and then vote.

DISCUSSION: Committee members discussed issues regarding differing expectations for writing in various departments throughout the University. They raised additional questions as to the difference between the UC exam and the SAT. Professor Gadda addressed the questions and also informed the committee that administering the test is becoming a logistical issue. The test centers, which are California high schools, do not have enough resources to accommodate 300-400 students. However, this situation may change due to assessments for the Common Core standards.

Professor Gadda remarked that he would try to frame some discussion points about the future of the AWPE for the April meeting. By that time, he also will send committee members seven to nine essays culled from the pretest that will represent the range of performance from the weakest to the

strongest. The committee will then decide at the April meeting if each of those essays meets AWPE's requirements.

The committee members read the sample prompts and discussed strengths, weaknesses, and implications of each. One of the samples was largely agreed to be unsatisfactory. The other two samples were accepted equally as possible prompts for the AWPE.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

Academic Council Chair Powell introduced Vice President Sakaki and announced to the committee that President Yudof is retiring at the end of August. He observed that the University is in better shape than when President Yudof first arrived. The search for his replacement is underway; there will be no interim president. Similarly, the search for the UC Riverside chancellor is underway.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate (ICAS) meeting was held a week ago; one of the main topics was open education resources. Two bills (1052 and 1053) sponsored by California Senate President pro Tem Steinberg were enacted last year. These bills are intended to provide up to \$10M for open education resources, however, no part of that funding is available at this time. Mr. Steinberg has asked that UC, CSU, and the CCC appoint three faculty each to serve on a Council for Open Education Resources. ICAS is also undertaking the rewriting of science competencies; this is likely to be a two to three year process.

Chair Powell informed the committee about discussion surrounding the proposed revision to WASC requirements for upper division GE. Although the changes most likely would not have affected UC, they would have considerable impact CSU and CCC. ICAS voted to urge WASC not to change the handbook.

Chair Powell stated that the SCIGETC has been renamed "IGETC for STEM." This change is the result of SB 1440 creating AA degrees for transfer; it requires that ICAS include IGETC or CSU GE breadth. IGETC for STEM was renamed to be consistent with the law.

He also noted that BOARS has updated areas in English and math, and encouraged committee members to review them. These most recent changes were made in reference to the Common Core state standards.

Chair Powell described the two consortia that are working to determine assessments for Common Core. California is part of the Smarter Balance consortium, with about half the other states. These assessments are to be brought into California in math and language arts in spring of 2015; they will be administered to students in grades 3-8 and then again in the junior year of high school. Intense pressure is being placed on UC and other institutions to use these tests as a way to determine college readiness. Chair Powell expressed concern about these tests, which are to be based CSU assessments. He said that UCOPE needs to be proactive to defend the quality of math and language arts. He suggested that the committee meet more often, perhaps via iLinc, to debate and discuss the matter.

A committee member explained that the Lumina Foundation, the wealthiest postsecondary funding foundation in the country, has announced a goal to increase the number of students who have postsecondary degrees 60 percent by 2025. Lumina is also a partial funder of the Smarter Balance consortium and has a very aggressive agenda for postsecondary education that is tied to the idea of

career readiness. The Lumina Foundation will publish a new report that defines competency by the achievement of particular competencies rather than credit hours. The committee member stated that efforts like these reflect back on the importance of assessment as a driver of instruction. She stated that UC assessment needs to be very sensitive to the context of the University and that assessments based on CSU models are not suited to UC.

Chair Powell told the committee that the governor's budget provides \$125M in deferred buyout of 2011-12 tuition, and approximately another \$125M (representing a five percent budget increase). Of that money, \$10M was carved out by the governor for online education. Governor Brown would like UC to increase the student-faculty ratio and is also interested in online education as a way of saving money.

UC is discussing a proposal that would bring the general obligation bonds held by the state under the University; UC could then refinance the bonds at a better rate and save approximately \$80M.

V. **Consultation with the President's Office**

Report from the AWPE Coordinator

Director of Undergraduate Admissions Michael Treviño told the committee that BOARS is taking an interest in assessment as well, and is going to be looking closely at total scores and assessment and how they function as predictors of success.

Mr. Treviño stated that AWPE lost money in 2009, before change to online scoring. In the first year of online scoring (2010), the loss was cut in half. In 2011, AWPE broke even, and 2012 it was solidly in the black, thanks to operational changes over the past four years. This last year, AWPE increased campus reimbursement for campus-based testing, and introduced a tiered exam fee structure based on financial need.

VI. **UCOPE Consultation on UC Santa Barbara Planned Pilot for AWPE Testing in China**

ISSUE: Chair Alexander stated that he has been approached by deans systemwide asking about the possibility offering the AWPE overseas. These queries are in response to dramatic increases in international student recruitment, in some cases doubling from year to year. Currently, international students do not take the exam until they arrive on campus in September; this late assessment prevents students from being placed into the appropriate courses and they quickly fall behind.

Santa Barbara has designated testing sites in Shanghai and Beijing for students who have submitted a SIR for UCSB; no more than 100 students would be tested, and four campus staff would be sent to proctor the exam. This test would take place at the same time as California exam, enabling the campus to prepare for the students' needs and get them placed appropriately

DISCUSSION: Members discussed the extremely variant percentage of international students from campus to campus, with an agreed understanding of the difficulties arising from the late assessment of international students. It was noted that US students outside of California cannot take the test before they come to campus; likewise students from countries other than China. Questions were also raised as to the permissions possibly needed from the Chinese government for such an undertaking. Most members seemed to agree that many departments within the University would need to review, discuss, and vet the program before it could be undertaken, even as a pilot. Chair Alexander offered that the committee's role was to determine if administering the test overseas is sound and in the best interest of the international students. It would then be turned over to admissions and to OP for their consideration.

ACTION: Compile UCOPE comments and concerns on the proposed pilot planned for spring 2013 via email.

VII. UCOPE Roundtable on International Students

ISSUE: Chair Alexander noted that Irvine’s English, ESL, and ELL programs are being put under tremendous pressure by the recent deluge of international students. Those students also need extra assistance around acculturation as well as language; they are often isolated by their lack of English communication skills and do not adjust well to campus life.

DISCUSSION: Committee members discussed possible options and strategies for helping international students adapt linguistically and culturally to the campuses. Questions were raised as to whether some campuses encouraged international enrollment as a way of making money without thinking through the responsibility to international students. It was mentioned that BOARS had a strict policy that campuses cannot accept a student from out of the state or country who does not meet or exceed the standards for a California student; members questioned if this policy was being honored.

Chair Alexander recalled a white paper written a couple of years ago and presented to the Senate. The white paper encouraged the campuses to make sure that academic English, ESL, ELL, and related programs were fully funded and either integrated into writing programs or working in close collaboration with them. While the impetus at that time was not international students, it may be appropriate to revisit the paper in regard to this item.

ACTION: Administer an online poll to determine whether the previous white paper should be resubmitted in response to current concerns regarding international students. If it is deemed appropriate, the paper will be circulated to the committee via email so that it can be discussed in detail at the next meeting and voted upon.

VIII. Standardization of the Awarding of Advanced Placement (AP) Credit Across the UC System

ISSUE: AP credit is used very divergently systemwide in relation to course credit and requirements. Particularly problematic is the practice of excluding students from preparatory classes based upon their high AP scores. It was observed that students who have higher AP scores tend to come from wealthier families and from schools with high API scores; their scores may reflect better preparation, not necessarily better ability. Furthermore, high school students are perhaps being misled into thinking they will get college credit for high AP scores – a practice that is not uniformly exercised systemwide.

DISCUSSION: The committee considered whether a systemwide policy should be put in place to dictate how AP scores in English and math should be applied on the campuses. It was agreed that campuses should not be allowed to preclude students with high AP scores from taking GE writing courses or other preparatory classes in English or math. Questions were raised as to whether this issue should be properly undertaken by UCEP. It was suggested that a joint task force between UCEP and UCOPE should look at the issue more broadly. Such a task force should include student representatives and representatives from BOARS. It was observed that the AP program has been scrutinizing courses and revamping exams; this would be an opportune time to examine the role of AP test scores within the UC campuses.

IX. Update on Systemwide Math Diagnostic Test

The MDTP (Math Diagnostic Testing Program) has been used by the CCC, CSU, and UC for over 30 years. However, campus practices in regard to the program are unclear. MDTP has both assessment and placement tests. UC is considering giving students a diagnostic test so that students can learn what skills they need in order to score well on their fall placement exams. The diagnostic test would provide students with the option of taking classes over the summer to improve their fall placement grades.

X. Discussion of Budget Concerns and the Future of Preparatory Education in the UC System

The committee discussed OP’s ongoing emphasis on online preparatory classes and the need to have UCOPE at the table for the discussion of online education in teaching writing. One option is a series of online modules that could be used in conjunction with writing courses as opposed to being stand-alone courses of their own. It was observed that UCLA is running a Summer Sophomore Online program for students who may need GE units. These courses are offered through summer session, and students can take them from home. Strong assessment is critical, and needs to be integral to such courses.

It was decided to discuss this issue further at the next meeting.

XI. New Business

No new business was brought forward.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Jonathan Alexander
Prepared by Fredye Harms

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION (UCOPE)

Jonathan Alexander, Chair

jfalexan@uci.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE

University of California

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 23, 2011

DANIEL SIMMONS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR

Re: UCOPE White Paper: The Case for ESL Instruction and English Language Support Services

Dear Dan:

Last term, UCOPE enthusiastically endorsed the UCOPE ESL Advisory Group's "white paper" that urges the University to fully fund academic English support course work and services as a part of the students' academic curricula. In the paper, UCOPE makes a strong case for providing the majority of the coursework and services to students on campus during regular academic terms through academic programs rather than through extension programs, summer session, and community colleges. UCOPE forcefully argues that UC's English language support services should be supported and not outsourced. A copy of the paper is attached.

UCOPE respectfully requests that Academic Council:

- 1) Endorse the white paper;
- 2) Forward the white paper to local divisions; and
- 3) Request that the Provost disseminate copies to Graduate Deans and EVCs on the campuses.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Alexander, Ph.D.
 Chair, UCOPE

Copy: Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director
 UCOPE Members

The Case for ESL Instruction and English Language Support Services
Presented by the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE)
July 2010

A number of recent decisions and proposals related to the disposition of English language support programs and services across the UC system come at a critical time. At UC Davis and UCLA, efforts have been made to reduce or eliminate the funding for on-campus English language support services, for instance, outsourcing them to UC extension programs, summer session, and local community colleges. At UCLA, the Program in Academic English has been asked to fund its own lecturers. At UC Berkeley, the Technical Communication Program, which offered a special course designed specifically to provide academic language support for non-native English speakers, was eliminated in May 2010. All lecturer positions have been eliminated and no future accommodation for non-native speakers within Engineering is planned. At UC Riverside, last year's discussion of conducting a nationwide search for instructors specializing in ESL instruction has been discontinued.

The dismantling and outsourcing of effective UC English language support services is perplexing. These services have been carefully designed to help such diverse populations as first-year undergraduates, transfer students, international graduate students, and Education Abroad students. Those who benefit from these campus-wide services study in departments across all disciplines, with heavy emphasis in science and engineering, and their success is central to the key teaching and research missions of the University. Services that help students master the high level of accuracy required in academic writing, the listening skills necessary to understand lectures, the speaking skills for giving effective oral presentations and the communicative competence for participating in an academic environment are vital to UC's commitment to preparing and fostering the academic success of all UC students. They are critical to its vision of access and excellence.

We understand that difficult financial choices must be made. Given long-standing debates about the place of remedial courses in the UC system and the fact that many of the so-called remedial courses are taught by non-Senate faculty, it is not surprising that UC campuses, in these very difficult financial times, are looking carefully at programs and courses considered to be remedial and are considering whether they might save funding by sending students accepted to the UCs to extension programs, summer session and community colleges for this coursework. Those who are unfamiliar with university level academic English courses for second language students often assume ESL instruction consists primarily of textbook or computer-assisted grammar exercises and perhaps brief writing assignments designed to remediate sentence-level grammatical, lexical and mechanical errors. In fact, however, such descriptions do not characterize ESL courses in any of the UC programs. The courses and services that the various UC campuses provide students are in no way remedial. In fact, ESL per se is not considered remedial by California's postsecondary institutions, as documented in the most recent statement of English competencies expected of entering freshmen published by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), a report endorsed by the three Academic Senates. (See addendum.)

We believe that at the heart of the matter lies the fact that the special academic literacy needs of UC's multilingual students cannot be addressed well by the community colleges, summer session, or extension programs. UC students should not be required to pay for courses through the community colleges, summer session or extension programs, since non-remedial courses should be offered on campus. It should be noted that many of UC's undergraduates are on financial aid and must work long hours in addition to attending classes; for these students, the mounting cost of college tuition alone presents a challenge; to ask them to pay for academic language support services and coursework is an additional burden. To ask them to commute from their home UC campus to another institution located off-campus to complete regular UC coursework limits their time for study and employment. The University should not penalize them. We might also point out that the community colleges face reductions that are even harsher than those faced by the UCs and may well lack funding to provide community college courses to UC students, whether the courses are offered on a UC campus or at a community college.

The issue of the academic preparation of the state's domestic undergraduate students is an important one, with increasing numbers of multilingual undergraduate students being admitted to UC campuses. Many of these

students lack the academic literacy skills needed to read college-level, complex texts independently, fluently and proficiently. Many of them also lack the ability to compose effectively, clearly conveying intricate or multifaceted information. It is noteworthy that students arriving to UC campuses from public schools that have low Academic Performance Index ratings with few financial resources are disproportionately more likely to face challenges coping with UC academic reading and writing assignments than their better educated, native English-speaking, wealthier peers. The consequences of dismantling English language support services are severe for everyone, but they are disproportionately so for those who are already behind academically and linguistically when arriving at a UC campus.

The University must serve domestic students who graduate from the most academically rigorous high schools as well as students who graduate from the least rigorous ones. If, as UC President Mark Yudof suggests, the University wants to continue helping the “invest in human capital and grow home talent,” it must serve all the state’s students, and not just students of specific zip codes and particular language backgrounds. The academic preparation of international undergraduate students is also critical. Increasing numbers of international undergraduate students are now being admitted to many of our UC campuses. At UC Davis, for instance, Chancellor Linda Katehi’s *Transformative Vision* for the campus includes a “multicultural community of learning and scholarship,” with “increases in the number of underrepresented students” as well as “increases in the number of non-resident and international undergraduate students, and international graduate and professional students.” At UC Irvine, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Gottfredson strongly supports changing UCI into a “Global Village.” At UCSD and UCLA, the Chancellors there are also reshaping visions to accommodate additional numbers of international undergraduate students. Dismantling or outsourcing ESL programs and services across the UC system is untimely and inappropriate if such visions are to be carried out.

From a purely financial perspective, recruiting international undergraduate students is understandable, since these students will pay large out-of-state tuition fees that contribute substantial new revenues to UC campuses. However, enrolling international students who are studying in a new language and cultural environment brings with it a certain responsibility, part of which is making sure that the resources exist to ensure these students’ success. Only strong campus English language support programs and services with expert instructors will give students the language support they need to reach the high level of writing and speaking required for successful university-level work in their fields of study. Without this support, future recruitment efforts may be deterred. Campus support is also required for international graduate students, including support for international teaching assistants. It is imperative that campus experts in ESL and in TA training provide these support services.

State law is particularly relevant to ESL instruction for graduate students and explicitly calls for the University to adopt and enforce “policies and incentives for improving teaching,” with the development of courses designed to provide international teaching assistants with the English skills needed for them to teach effectively. The legislation is intended to address the English language problems of international teaching assistants at the University of California and requests that the University adopts and enforces “policies and incentives for improving teaching,” including the development of courses designed to provide international teaching assistants with the English skills needed to teach effectively. SB 400 (Haynes, 1995) strengthened ACR 41 and adds provisions 66080-66083 to Article 7, Chapter 2, Title 2 of the California Education Code. These provisions mandate that all faculty members (including teaching assistants) be assessed for English proficiency and that they be required to become proficient if they are found not to be:

Each institution of public higher education shall evaluate its instructional faculty for oral and written proficiency in the English language in the classroom. In an institution where a majority of the students speak English, if a member of the instructional faculty is unable to demonstrate proficiency in oral or written communication, he or she shall be required to improve oral and written communication skills through courses, workshops, or programs specifically designed for this purpose.

While acknowledging the current budget difficulties, we believe that the cost of implementing English language support programs and services is quite modest, especially in view of the contributions these programs and services have made to promoting UC, state, national and international concerns. Many of these programs and

services are financial successes. UC Irvine, for example, has successfully obtained funding from private gifts as well as federal and state contracts and grants, totaling over nine million dollars. Indirect cost recovery funding from contracts and grants supports the costs of research administration and operation and maintenance of research facilities. It should also be noted that the faculty involved in delivering English language instructional services has played major roles in state, national, and international efforts to improve the education of second language learners not only in higher education but also in elementary and secondary education.

To protect the quality of the existing programs and services, we suggest that these programs be given the support of tenured academic senate faculty since this faculty has the power to promote these programs and services and prevent them from being dismantled or outsourced; it is critical that such faculty appreciate the language concerns of UC's multilingual students and the value of programs and services that meet their needs. Further, we suggest that the programs and services be housed on UC campuses, and that sufficient funding be allocated to provide students with adequate services and numbers of suitable courses. Finally, we suggest that on all campuses, the programs work closely with composition programs to ensure that coursework and services are appropriately aligned. With respect to some campuses, after careful consideration and evaluation, it may make sense to house academic writing or other English language support courses within composition programs, especially in cases in which strong faculty support exists for the courses, the missions are similar, and the instructors benefit from working together.

UC's English language support services should be *supported*, not outsourced. When students are unable to improve their proficiency in academic English, it affects the health of entire campuses, undermining the students' ability to contribute to campus programs. Moreover, it puts at risk the academic stature of the University and affects future student recruitment efforts. Students who are unable to receive the English language support they require may fail to progress academically, spend additional time to degree, or not receive UC diplomas with the English proficiency necessary to advance in their later careers. They may even end up tarnishing the reputation of the University.

Students should not be charged additionally for services that were previously available to them as part of their tuition package. Neither the domestic student population (which faces rising tuition costs and who are often low income, first-generation college students) nor the international student population (which is already experiencing the financial drain of rising tuition costs) can afford to be singled out in this manner by the University. They should not be asked to bear so much of the burden of the state's budget crisis. These students, who are regularly admitted to the University, are often among the brightest and most diligent of UC students. Requiring them to enroll in costly summer, extension, or community college courses to develop their English proficiency marginalizes them from the mainstream of the University and undermines their academic progress. UC's students, native English-speaking or not, expect and deserve to be taught by UC faculty.

We urge the University to fund fully academic English support course work and services as a part of the students' academic curricula. Further, we advocate providing the majority of the coursework and services to students on campus during regular academic terms through academic programs rather than through extension programs, summer session, and community colleges.

Addendum

Why ESL Instruction and English Language Support Services at UC are not Remedial

In 2002, the Academic Senates of the University of California, the California State University and the California Community Colleges endorsed the revision of the original 1982 *ICAS Statement on Competencies Expected of Entering Freshman*.¹ This revision, produced by a faculty task force and titled “*Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California’s Public Colleges and Universities*,” clearly states the relationship between ESL instruction and instruction regarded as remedial (p. 31):

Instruction in academic English for second language learners should be distinguished from remedial instruction, just as foreign language instruction for native English speakers is not considered remedial...L2 learners, their peers, parents, teachers, and administrators should understand that special language instruction is not remedial. Given this awareness, L2 students will be more likely to further develop academic English through ESL work at the college level.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates has continuously recognized ESL as a discipline in its reports and projects. The Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC) project, funded from 1999-2006 through a \$2.74 million grant, included ESL as one of five disciplines in the Language Cluster.² IMPAC participants held regional meetings annually with the goal of facilitating transfer from the California Community Colleges to the UCs and CSUs. In 2003, when the Language Cluster was added to the IMPAC Project, Jan Frodesen, Director of the English for Multilingual Students Program at UC Santa Barbara, was asked by the UC Academic Senate to be the ESL Discipline Lead for IMPAC, a position she held during the final three years of the project. Clearly, ICAS has not regarded ESL as remedial education but rather as a discipline in its own right. The University of California Academic Senate, in asking Dr. Frodesen to be the ESL Discipline Lead, supported this recognition of advanced level academic ESL courses as non-remedial.

ESL as a discipline has been distinguished from remedial education not only by California’s postsecondary system but in reports and research nationwide. As just one example, *State Policies on Community College Remedial Education: Findings from a National Survey* (Education Commission of the States, 2002, pg. 2)³ states: “‘Remedial education’ is defined as those courses in reading, writing or mathematics offered to students lacking the necessary academic skills to perform college-level work. This definition does not include ... English as a Second Language (ESL) programs.”

In addition to these more general distinctions between ESL and remedial instruction, we may look to the University of California’s definition of remedial work in English, which provides further evidence that UC ESL undergraduate writing courses, including those at UC Davis, should not be considered remedial.

The University of California Academic Senate Manual, Regulation 761, defines remedial work as follows:

Remedial work in English is defined as work primarily focused on topics in spelling, punctuation and usage, and in the basic structures of sentences, paragraphs, and short essays.

¹ Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California’s Public Colleges and Universities. Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates, 2002. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/acadlit.pdf>

² More information about the IMPAC Project as well as the ESL discipline meeting reports is available online at www.impac.org. Other language disciplines included English, Foreign Languages, Journalism, Speech/ Communication. Composition was not included as a discipline but was discussed within the English and ESL disciplines.

³ Davis Jenkins and Katherine Boswell. *State Policies on Community College Remedial Education: Findings from a National Survey*. Document Number: 4081, Center for Community College Policy, 2002. <http://www.ecs.org/html/Document.asp?chouseid=4081>

Policy regarding credit for English as a Second Language will be determined by individual Divisions. (Effective Fall 1984)
(Am 23 May 96)

All of the UC courses and services intended for non-native speakers of English are designed to teach students to use academic language analytically to accomplish a variety of intellectually challenging tasks. They teach students sophisticated academic language, enabling them to demonstrate, at an advanced linguistic level of competence, their ability to use a variety of writing techniques, modes of development, and formal conventions, and to demonstrate advanced literacy skills, for instance, being able to locate, analyze and incorporate information gathered from multiple sources into their writing. Students do not write short paragraphs or essays, but instead do regular extensive reading and write multiple drafts of full-length essays, often in response to one or more reading passages. Unlike composition courses designed for native English speakers, courses and services designed for non-native English speakers who are not yet proficient in academic language are tailored to the specific needs of second language writers who often struggle with the complexities of English as a second or third language.

The ESL courses and support services designed for graduate students also are not remedial in any way. The focus of these courses is not on basic foundational features of English. Enrolled students are considered “advanced” in English proficiency but still need to continue to develop the high level of academic language proficiency needed for master’s and doctoral work. Some entering international graduate students have produced theses and other research papers in languages other than English, ones that include rhetorical moves that differ from those used in academic English. In ESL writing courses, students analyze, produce and get feedback on literature reviews, conference and paper abstracts, research proposals, research reports and critiques. In ESL oral communication courses, the emphasis is placed on the building of advanced-level oral proficiency that enables students to engage in academic discussions and inquiry, to analyze and explain a range of academic topics, and debate scholarly issues. In both the speaking and the writing courses, the emphasis is placed on writing analytical, discipline-specific