ESL Students in California ❖ Public Higher Education

Acknowledgments

Members of the Task Force

Jan Frodesen, Chair, Lecturer SOE, Director of ESL, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara

Virginia B. Berger, ESL Instructor and Program Chair, Grossmont College

Janet Eyring, Professor, Department of Modern Languages & Literatures, California State University, Fullerton

John Gamber, Professor of ESL, American River College.

Janet Lane, Lecturer and Coordinator of ESL for Graduate Students, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Davis

Mark Wade Lieu, Professor of ESL, Ohlone College

Ellen Lipp, Professor of Linguistics and ESL Coordinator, California State University, Fresno

Karen Russikoff, Professor, English & Foreign Languages, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Jane R. Stevens, Associate Professor, Department of Music, University of California, San Diego.

Consulting Members

Roberta Ching, Chair, Learning Skills Center, California State University, Sacramento

Kathleen Flynn, Professor of ESL, Glendale Community College

Table of Contents

List of Tables

From ICAS Chairs

Dear Colleague:

The enclosed English as a Second Language (ESL) Task Force Report represents a response to questions raised by some educators and legislators about ESL programs, practices, and support services across the three California postsecondary systems: the California Community Colleges (CCCs), the California State Universities (CSUs), and the University of California (UC). This report was produced to address the particular concerns of the California Community College (CCC) Board of Governors and is the culminating report from an Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Task Force formed to research and report on the status of ESL students in the three segments of public higher education in California. Incorporating findings from a web-based survey submitted to ESL professionals at the UC, the CSUs and the CCCs, the report focuses on institutional responses to the particular needs of and challenges facing non-native speakers of English as they pursue vocational certificates, advanced training, degrees, and self-betterment through California's public colleges and universities.

The ICAS Task Force comprised professionals in the field of ESL and applied linguistics from all three segments. In addition, the task force included a representative from outside the fields of ESL and applied linguistics to provide a broader perspective and to ensure that this final report be accessible not only to those in the field but more importantly also to those outside of it. This strong collaboration permitted a broader view of the experiences of ESL learners and offered insights into the specific issues that ESL learners face as they transition between the three segments.

As is often true with surveys, the results in many cases raise more questions than they answer. While the responses show great awareness of the needs of ESL learners, they reveal the disparities in how institutions respond to these needs. One problem that the task force members faced throughout the research was the difficulty in obtaining data about ESL learners. This community is not easy to categorize let alone identify on a college/university campus; yet, a means of identification needs to be developed in order to facilitate future collection of information about ESL learners and what works for them. The ten recommendations found in the report highlight the need for further work that needs to be done.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates joins the authors of the report in the fervent hope that this report will be widely read and shared, and that the issues covered and raised will engender further discussion and action to bring academic success to ESL learners in California's public colleges and universities.

Ian Walton, President, Academic Senate for California Community Colleges
Marshelle Thobaben, Chair, California State University Academic Senate
Michael Brown, Vice Chair, University of California Academic Council

Executive Summary

Introduction

The increasing numbers of immigrant students in the United States and the special needs of English as a second language (ESL) learners have been prominent topics in national conversations about education at all levels. Nowhere in the United States have educational issues concerned with ESL learners been more prominent than in California, where language minority students comprise nearly 40% of all K-12 students and an ever growing population of postsecondary students. Many ESL learners have ESL problems that lead to special challenges when they need to use academic English in college and university classes. Therefore, there is a critical need for California colleges and universities to find effective ways of educating the rapidly growing population of learners who speak a language other than English at home in order to help them achieve a wide range of educational, professional, and career goals.

Although California's postsecondary ESL learners are extremely diverse in their ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, they tend to belong to one of several very broadly defined populations. One group consists of long-term immigrants or American-born children of immigrants who reside in non-English linguistic communities. These learners, sometimes called generation 1.5 students, have done most, if not all, of their schooling in the United States, yet are still striving to reach competency in college-level oral and written academic work. A second population includes more recently arrived immigrant students, who may or may not have developed first language literacy and who may have completed several years of schooling in the United States; these students are generally more easily identifiable as second language learners than the longer term immigrants. A third population, the size of which varies significantly from campus to campus, consists of international students, who exhibit a wide range of different native languages and cultures and have typically developed first language literacy skills. There are many students in each of these groups who still need special assistance in using English effectively in their academic work, and who, therefore, present challenges for institutions, programs and individual teachers.

This report responds to some of the key questions raised by educators and legislators about ESL practices, programs and support services across the three California postsecondary systems: the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC).

◆ Are campuses effectively distinguishing those non-native English speakers who need specialized instruction to achieve academic success from those who do not need it?

◆ Are the assessment and placement procedures we currently have for ESL learners adequate?

◆ What kinds of programs, courses and support services are currently offered for ESL learners? How could they be more effective?

While this report was produced to address the particular concerns of the California Community College Board of Governors, the concerns of the Board are shared by a great many others, both within the CCC system and beyond it. The problems facing ESL learners affect not only their ability to be successful within or transfer between public institutions of higher education, but also their ability to fully participate in and contribute to the social and economic well-being of the State of California. It is with this broader perspective in mind that the Task Force recommends that this report, its findings, and its recommendations be shared with faculty, staff, and administration in all three segments of public higher education in California, intersegmental groups, California professional organizations concerned with the specific needs of ESL learners, legislators and other governmental entities, as well as our colleagues in K-12 education, where many ESL learners begin their education in the United States.

This report is based on an online survey, statistical data from education web pages and the collective knowledge of the Task Force members. The online survey used to gather information for this report was designed in extensive consultation with the Director of the University of California, Santa Barbara, Social Science Survey Center. For each college and university campus, the ESL Task Force identified and contacted respondents whom they believed would be qualified to answer the survey questions.

Faculty and administrators who responded included professors, instructors, lecturers and program directors or coordinators. Over 82% of the respondents reported that teaching was at least a part of their position. Of the 109 community colleges, representatives from 61 (56%) completed the survey. Of the 23 California State Universities, 12 responded. Of the ten University of California campuses, the eight that have ESL classes or programs (San Francisco and Merced do not) were asked to complete the survey, all of whom did so.

Survey Findings

Identification, Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners

The findings of this survey support the belief of many educators involved in ESL and English programs that the identification, assessment and placement of ESL learners is a critical issue on our campuses.

Identification of ESL learners is complicated and inconsistent, and this hinders any effort to collect information about their status and progress. In the majority of community colleges, self-identification is the primary tool for identifying ESL learners. However, some students are reluctant to self-identify as ESL learners because of the perceived stigma. In addition, there are generation 1.5 students, who do not fit neatly in either the traditional ESL or native-speaker categories. Culturally, these students are not ESL learners. However, results on placement tests and students' work in classes show that they have ESL features in academic writing and reading. At CSU, freshmen, when taking the English Placement Test (EPT), can self-identify as being second language users of English. This self-identification shows students' language background but not whether they have ESL problems. For the UC, entering freshmen may be identified as having writing errors characteristic of the writing of non-native speakers of English when they take the UC Systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE).

While some students may be initially identified as ESL learners, on-going identification is lacking, and this hinders collection of longitudinal data to track their progress beyond ESL coursework. Of the campuses responding to the survey, 75% of CSUs and 88% of UCs designate incoming freshmen as ESL learners, for students who transfer in, only 27% of CSUs and 14% of UCs make an ESL designation.

Survey responses identified significant issues in the areas of assessment and placement. While writing theory and research support the use of writing samples for assessment and placement into writing courses, fewer than 40% of community colleges employ a writing sample citing the expenditure of money and time needed to evaluate the samples. Validation of tests is also an issue due to the lack of support for research functions. While ESL courses often serve as the prerequisites for enrollment in English, the community colleges do not impose a time frame within which ESL coursework must be completed. In addition, of the three quarters of CCC respondents who indicated the existence of prerequisites, a large majority (83%) indicated that students could challenge the prerequisite for a course.

Within the CSU system, entering freshmen take the English Placement Test (EPT) as an assessment of their language ability. This test is taken by all students and makes no accommodation for non-native English learners. Only 27% of respondents indicated

that an additional placement test specifically for second language learners of English is employed in the assessment process. With the implementation of regulations governing remediation, students who achieve low scores on the EPT have one year to remediate before being redirected to a community college to complete remediation in English before being readmitted to a CSU. For students transferring from a community college, the assumption at most CSUs is that fulfillment of GE Breadth or an Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) pattern indicates that a student has achieved the academic writing proficiency needed for upper division work. However, results on campus-specific junior-level writing proficiency exams may indicate that a student continues to manifest significant second-language writing problems.

At UCs, each individual campus has a placement process for students who have received "E" designations on the AWPE. The "E" designation is given to non-passing essays when non-native English features have contributed to the non-passing score. On five of the eight campuses, ESL or writing program faculty re-read the "E"-designated examinations to make placement decisions into either ESL or mainstream courses. Respondents indicate that many "E"-designations are now for generation 1.5 students, who have received most or all of their education in the United States. UC campuses typically afford students one or two years to successfully complete the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). Those identified on writing tests as needing ESL instruction are usually given additional time to allow enrollment in ESL courses to develop their writing proficiency. Community college transfers to UC are assumed to have the academic writing proficiency needed for upper division work.

ESL Courses and Programs

A second major area for which the survey collected extensive data across the three systems concerned the range and types of courses and programs designed for ESL learners as well as respondents' perceived needs for courses or programs not being currently offered. The survey also sought to determine where courses and programs for ESL learners were housed and the extent to which courses were credit bearing.

Of those campuses who responded, almost all CCC campuses (98%) report having ESL classes. Most of the CSU campuses responding (83%) report having such courses. However, since only half of the CSU campuses responded to the survey, it should not be assumed that the majority of CSU campuses have ESL courses. In fact, many of the CSU campuses do not offer ESL courses. All of the UC campuses report offering ESL classes. CCC respondents report offering ESL courses through diverse departments and programs; most frequently through ESL departments (47) followed by English departments (14). On CSU campuses, English departments are the most common academic home for ESL courses. At UC campuses, writing programs are the departments or programs most frequently offering the

ESL courses. UC ESL courses are generally targeted to freshmen, while the CSUs have ESL courses that serve both freshmen and upper-division students. It should also be noted that for at least some CSUs, the populations served by the ESL classes are mainly international students and not immigrant ESL learners.

While all three segments offer a broad range of levels of writing courses, only CCCs offer a wide range of levels in the other skill areas, including reading, listening, speaking, grammar, and multi-skills. CCCs report offering from one to six or more levels of ESL writing instruction, CSUs report offering from two to four levels of ESL writing instruction including upper division ESL writing, and UCs report offering from one to five levels of ESL writing instruction but with more than half of UCs reporting offering only one level of ESL writing.

Among CSU respondents, half report that all ESL courses are credit bearing, 40% report that some are credit bearing and 10% report that none are credit bearing. Among UC respondents, 71% state that all ESL courses are credit bearing and 29% report that none are credit bearing. Eighty-four of the 109 community colleges report offering ESL courses for credit, but credit may or may not be applicable towards the associate degree. Community colleges also offer noncredit ESL courses.

The majority of CCC and CSU respondents and some UC respondents report that additional ESL courses are needed on their campuses to meet ESL learners' needs. Many community colleges report needing additional sections of classes already offered. The need for additional sections of existing classes is less pronounced at CSU and UC campuses.

The survey also asked respondents to comment on program evaluation methods. CCC, CSU, and UC campuses report a variety of ways to engage in program evaluation. At UC campuses, it is fairly common to have an outside evaluator participate in the evaluation, while at CSU and CCC it is much more common for a program to undergo a self-evaluation.

Support Services for ESL Learners

A third broad area for which this report collected information was that of support services designated especially for ESL learners. These services included orientation and advising, counseling, tutoring, outreach, assistance to disabled ESL learners, job placement and career services. While for programs and courses information, the survey did not distinguish between international and resident ESL learners, this distinction proved important when surveying support services for these two populations.

Orientation and initial advising are viewed as extremely important services to support ESL learners. In the CCC, where the number of international students varies greatly, orientation and initial advisement are offered about as frequently for international learners as other ESL

learners. However, in the CSU and UC, specially tailored orientation and initial advisement are offered more frequently for international students than for other ESL learners. This is most pronounced in the CSU, where most of the campuses offer these types of services to international students but less than a third to other ESL learners. The overall rating for these orientation services for ESL learners (both resident/immigrant and international) is generally positive in the UCs and CCCs with 60% of the respondents rating them good or excellent and less positive for the CSU, with only 22% rating them as good or excellent.

Ongoing counseling is regarded as another important support area to promote retention and assist "at risk" learners, among other purposes. The findings of the survey indicate that international students, to a much greater extent than immigrant students, have counseling services available to meet their special needs. Sixty percent of CCCs offer ESL counseling to international students, but fewer than half report such a service for immigrant/resident students, many of whom could use it. Whereas over half the reporting CSUs provide counseling for international students, very few have ESL counseling for immigrants/residents. Counseling directed specifically to ESL students is offered to international students on only two UC campuses, one of which also provides counseling to immigrant/resident ESL students.

Fewer than 50% of the respondents in all three segments indicated that specific services for "at-risk" ESL learners are provided. The frequency of services seems to be greater in the CSUs (46%) than either the CCCs (33%) or the UCs (25%).

Tutoring has long been considered one of the most important support services on college and university campuses for second language learners, as evidenced by the considerable research and pedagogy devoted to this area in the field of Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) and Applied Linguistics. All three systems provide tutoring targeted specifically for ESL learners, both immigrant/resident and international. Tutoring services are provided more frequently for international students at the CSU than at other levels. However, 86% of the UC campuses provide tutoring services for immigrant/resident ESL learners, exceeding the other two systems by more than 15%. All three systems provide a range of tutoring services with some specialized tutors. The overall perceived effectiveness of such learning centers is mixed. Comments point out significant problems with tutoring services, among them the inadequacy of tutor training; insufficient pedagogical grammar knowledge on the part of tutors, which is essential for ESL writing tutoring; and a high turn-over rate once tutors are trained. Scheduling of tutors is sometimes not effective because there are insufficient numbers of tutors later in the semester when they are most needed. Finally, there is insufficient funding for the tutoring/learning centers as a whole.

While the need for outreach to secondary schools from the postsecondary systems has been widely discussed and programs implemented by many campuses, respondents to this survey from all segments report that, for the most part, they are not aware of outreach services to

ESL high school learners. In the case of both outreach efforts and transfer services, it is clear that more transfer counseling specifically directed toward ESL students and more sharing and/or collaboration among programs regarding outreach are needed to improve the flow of students between segments.

Responses to survey questions about other support services for ESL learners, such as disabled student services, financial aid, and job placement/career services, indicate such specialized services meeting ESL students' needs are offered only by a small number of institutions.

Conclusion and Recommendations

ESL learners are present on every campus of the three segments of public higher education in California. This is true whether or not an institution officially recognizes ESL learners on campus through programs and services designed for their special language needs.

Indeed, on some campuses, especially in the CCC system, ESL learners represent a growing majority of students. These students have varied ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds; partly for this reason, they are not always readily identifiable. They range from international students and recently-arrived immigrants to long-term immigrants and those who are born in the United States into non-English linguistic communities. Many in the latter two categories comprise the group identified throughout this report as generation 1.5.

The language development needs of ESL learners must be addressed because their educational progress and success, or the lack thereof, affect not only themselves but also their classmates, their instructors, their institutions, and ultimately the society at large. Those in positions to make decisions about institutional priorities need to recognize this situation and the fact that, based on current demographic data, the number of ESL learners in higher education in California will only continue to grow in the coming years. Ongoing communication among ESL educators is essential to an effective response to the needs of ESL learners in higher education.

The Task Force concludes with the following recommendations.

1. Our public higher education systems should work with legislators toward the goal of developing a statewide system for identifying ESL learners and tracking their progress through the higher educational segments.

2. Campuses should review current assessment and placement instruments, and, where needed, develop more accurate instruments and appropriate placement procedures for ESL students.

3. Campuses should provide ESL instruction and related support services to entering and transfer students, including generation 1.5 students.

4. Campuses should review the adequacy of current ESL instruction. Issues examined might include the following: skill areas and number of levels, appropriate class size, the number of course sections, degree applicability of courses, course repeatability, and program evaluation.

5. Campuses should encourage ESL learners to address their academic language needs in an appropriate and timely manner.

6. Campuses should coordinate and improve support services specifically designed to meet ESL learners' needs, keeping in mind the different populations (international students, immigrants both long-term and recently arrived, generation 1.5).

7. ESL professionals should be called on as resources in all areas of student support for working with ESL students.

8. Campuses should improve the identification of ESL students with learning disabilities and develop ways to meet their special needs.

9. Through intersegmental collaboration, a higher education website should be developed for ESL professionals from all three segments of public higher education in California. This could include such features as a directory of California public college and university ESL professionals, a searchable annotated bibliography of studies, program profiles, and reports that specifically focus on current ESL practices and issues in higher education, and links to these reports.

10. Each higher education system should institute a formal organization of ESL coordinators to develop ways to serve ESL students more effectively.

Introduction

The increasing numbers of immigrant students in the United States and the special needs of English as a second language (ESL) learners have been prominent topics in national conversations about education at all levels. Noting that English learners are one of the fastest growing populations in the United States, the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (2003) described the challenges faced by teachers as they confront the linguistic and cultural diversity of their students. The Commission's report stresses the need for educational institutions to serve these learners and build on their strengths, in the process "helping non-native speakers give eloquent voice to their experiences and aspirations."

Nowhere in the United States have educational issues concerned with English language learners been more prominent than in California, where language minority students comprise nearly 40% of all K-12 students and an ever growing population of postsecondary students. In the ten years between 1994 and 2004, while the total K-12 enrollment growth rate in California was only 7.8%, the Limited English Proficient (LEP) enrollment growth rate was more than 30% (CDE Report). Of the 1.6 million English learners enrolled in K-12, according to recent demographic data from the California Department of Education (CDE, 2005), 85% are speakers of Spanish; but the remaining 15% speak 59 different languages. As one more striking indication of California's unique challenges in addressing educational issues for immigrants, in the four years between 2001 and 2005, more than one of every five foreign immigrants to the United States settled in California (Kelley, 2005).

All of these demographic data indicate a critical need for California colleges and universities to find effective ways of educating the rapidly growing population of learners who speak a language other than English at home in order to help them achieve a wide range of educational, professional, and career goals. Indeed, the most recent review of the California Master Plan (University of California, 2002) identifies demographic changes as a central

challenge to preserving the Master Plan, including the problem at four-year universities of not keeping pace with ethnic diversity. With the large numbers of non-native English speaking immigrants making California their home, issues related to ethnic diversity cannot be separated from those related to linguistic diversity.

Thus it is that educators, administrators and legislators throughout California have raised many questions about the postsecondary education, both present and future, of our increasingly diverse English language learners. These questions include the following:

◆ Are campuses effectively distinguishing those non-native English speakers who need specialized instruction to achieve academic success from those who do not need it?

◆ Are the assessment and placement procedures we currently have for ESL learners adequate?

◆ What kinds of programs, courses and support services are currently offered for ESL learners? How could they be more effective?

◆ Do meaningful differences exist in what is offered across the three college/ university systems?

◆ How are programs and courses targeted toward these ESL learners staffed?

◆ Are California's higher education systems both training and hiring an adequate number of full-time professionals to administer ESL programs and to teach courses for a large range of levels and different skill areas?

◆ What attention is being paid to the education of ESL learners not only in ESL courses but in courses across the disciplines?

The grant project reported in this document responds to some of the key questions above by collecting comprehensive data about ESL practices, programs and support services across the three California postsecondary systems: the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California State University (CSU), and the University of California (UC). An ESL Task Force appointed by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) designed an online survey which was sent to CCC, CSU and UC faculty and administrators with knowledge of ESL issues on their individual campuses. The survey questions addressed these objectives:

1. To determine if and how students are identified as ESL learners for tracking progress and/or for gathering longitudinal data.

2. To determine how students are identified as ESL learners for the purposes of initial assessment selection and/or for the purposes of appropriate placement.

3. To identify the range of courses and program designs (credit-bearing, transferable, and noncredit) available to address the academic and vocational preparation of ESL learners across the segments, and the processes by which these programs are evaluated.

4. To identify how the placement of ESL learners into courses directed specifically toward the academic and vocational preparation of ESL learners across the segments is affected by matriculation practices (enforcement of prerequisites, waiver policies, timeline for completion, course repetition).

5. To determine the kinds of student support services in our institutions that are specifically targeted to ESL learners, whether prior to their enrollment or while they are enrolled in ESL courses, and after they have completed ESL coursework.

6. To determine the types of data on ESL learners that are collected and reported, and the ways in which they are gathered, both while the students are enrolled in ESL courses and after they complete ESL coursework.

From analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data collected in response to these objectives, and drawing on our professional expertise as well as that of colleagues, the ESL Task Force formulated recommendations for improving the academic and vocational preparation of ESL learners in our institutions.

Each of the three postsecondary education systems has historically responded to the education of English learners in different ways because of their different populations and different roles in the Master Plan.

ESL in California's Public Colleges and Universities

Since the 1970's, California has enrolled large numbers of immigrants and refugees from Latin America, Asia and Eastern Europe. As a result, California's public colleges and universities have for decades been responding to the academic literacy needs of students whose native language is other than English.

The population of English learners in our state has grown and changed in significant ways during the last several decades. One of the most important changes at the postsecondary level has been the tremendous increase in the number of students who have received most, if not all, of their education in the United States, but who speak a language other than English at home. Although many of these American-born or long-term immigrant students are fluent bilinguals whose academic English proficiency parallels that of their native English-speaking classmates, many others in this group lack competency in college-level oral and

The ESL Designation

In the early stages of this project, the Task Force encountered the problem of how to refer to the diverse groups of learners who are either non-native speakers of English or speak English and another language as a home language and who need specialized instruction in English. The K-12 system has adopted the term *English learners*; however, *ESL* has been the term most commonly used in the higher education systems, as evidenced by the fact that most college and university programs serving English language learners include ESL in their titles. In recent decades, educators have debated the use of "ESL" to designate bilingual or multilingual students who have academic English problems that differ from those of their monolingual English peers. In addition, as this report points out, students often feel stigmatized by the ESL label and may, as a result, avoid enrolling in ESL courses. Despite these problems with the use of ESL as a designation for the various populations of students who are still acquiring academic English, we used the terms "ESL learner" and "ESL student" for our online survey because "ESL" remains for now the term with which the majority of higher education professionals are familiar.

written academic English and have instructional needs that differ from those of their native English-speaking peers.

These long-term immigrants or, in some cases, American-born students, are often referred to in the fields of education and applied linguistics as "generation 1.5" since they have traits of both first and second-generation immigrants (Rumbaut, 1988). Within this population, many subgroups can be distinguished based on differences in first or second language use in different educational or social contexts, on an individual's identification with his or her home language or English as the dominant language, and so on. In other words, there is great linguistic as well as cultural diversity even within this group of learners. The term generation 1.5, then, is not meant to define a homogeneous group of English learners. Rather, it highlights the fact that second language acquisition, and in particular second language academic literacy acquisition, is usually a long and quite complex process, influenced by many sociolinguistic and sociocultural variables. Thus, many English language learners who from an early age may have been considered English proficient on the basis of oral skills find themselves struggling with the demands of academic English, especially at postsecondary levels.

In addition to serving the ever growing numbers of generation 1.5 students, California's colleges and universities continue to address the academic and vocational needs of two other large subgroups of ESL learners, international students and more recently arrived non-native English speaking immigrants. Although these three populations have different needs, they are often grouped together in college or university ESL classes on the basis of placement examinations. On many campuses, furthermore, ESL learners enroll in English reading or composition

classes designed primarily for native English speakers, presenting challenges for instructors who do not have specialized training in teaching English as a second language and/or lack appropriate materials to address their needs.

The three California postsecondary education systems have not only addressed a range of ESL issues within their individual systems but, prior to the project reported here, have collaborated under the auspices of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which is made up of representatives of the academic senates of all three public systems (CCC, CSU, and UC). In 1996 ESL professionals from the three systems, as well as ESL teachers from California high schools, produced the ICAS report *California Pathways: The Second Language Student in Public High Schools, Colleges, and Universities* (revised 2001), with the primary aim of defining ESL proficiency levels that could be used across secondary and postsecondary segments for curriculum development.

A second goal of the *California Pathways* project was to provide information for those unfamiliar with the field of English as a second language to enable them to better understand ESL learners and their needs. In the document, the intersegmental project committee revised the 1993 Community College ESL Proficiency Level Descriptors and described the ways in which second language learners acquire English, the challenges they face, and the distinctively different ESL populations that exist.

In the spring of 2002, an ICAS Task Force updated the 1982 English Competency Statement with *Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Student Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities*. Explaining the rationale for revising the earlier Statement of Competencies in English, the report notes that "California … extends public school education to a large population of students just learning the English language, a condition present but not as prevalent in 1982." The *Academic Literacy* report included responses to questions about the academic preparation of entering freshmen provided by CCC, CSU and UC faculty through a web-based survey. In sections on competencies for students whose home language is other than English, the Task Force reported that "the dominant perception among our faculty respondents is that many [ESL] students are not prepared to meet college level academic demands." *Academic Literacy* affirms the need for all second language learners entering postsecondary institutions to possess the same set of competencies for success as other students entering college. At the same time, the report emphasizes that teachers and administrators need to recognize the different subgroups of second language learners, distinguished by such factors as cultural differences, years of US schooling, and English language oral and written proficiency, and to provide appropriate instruction based on these differences.

Each of the three postsecondary education systems—CCC, CSU, and the UC—has responded to unique challenges, given their particular student populations and frameworks for

preparatory education. As set out in the California Master Plan in 1960, and affirmed in subsequent reviews, the three California postsecondary education systems share goals of access, affordability, equity and quality for our students; at the same time, however, each system also has a different mission in providing high-quality postsecondary education. These differences have informed the different ways each system has responded to the educational needs of ESL learners.

California Community College System

The CCC system consists of 109 colleges and 58 college centers in 72 districts, serving nearly two million students in credit and noncredit programs and courses. In addition, the colleges serve students through innumerable courses offered at off-site facilities throughout their service areas. Any Californian at least 18 years of age can enroll in a community college if she or he can demonstrate an "ability to benefit" from instruction. As a result, students enter the CCC system with a broad range of educational backgrounds and linguistic proficiencies. These students include, among others, recent immigrants, recent high school graduates, those who did not complete their high school education, and those seeking to update or upgrade job-related skills.

ESL has a central role in the mission of the CCCs as laid out in Education Code §66010.4 (2). Education Code states that one of "the essential and important functions of the community colleges" is to provide instruction in English as a second language when needed to enable students to succeed at the postsecondary level. Furthermore, English as a Second Language is one of the nine delineated service areas authorized for noncredit instruction offered by California community colleges.

The Board of Governors of the California Community College System has a long-standing interest in the preparation and progress of ESL learners within the system and in their movement into other segments of higher education. In general, the Board of Governors has focused on ESL under the broader heading of Basic Skills. Title 5 §55202 (d) defines "precollegiate basic skills" as "…courses in reading, writing, computation, and English as a second Language…" Thus, ESL is often viewed by the Board of Governors as a subset of basic skills, even though many community colleges have associate degree-applicable and transfer-level courses in ESL. In its recently adopted Strategic Plan (January 2006), the Board of Governors emphasizes the need to address the needs of ESL/Basic Skills students. Within the structure of the System Office for the CCC, there are two sub-units that oversee ESL: Basic Skills and ESL and Noncredit (Adult Education). In addition, there is an advisory committee specifically focused on ESL/Basic Skills.

Accountability measures used in the CCC System, such as Partnership for Excellence and Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges[1], include statistics about the persistence, success, and improvement rates of ESL learners.

California State University System

The CSU System, with 23 campuses, is the largest, the most ethnically diverse, and one of the most affordable university systems in the United States. Its main mission is to prepare students for the workforce and especially teachers for California schools.

For years, instructional programs for non-native English speaking students in the CSU have varied by campus, with some offering no ESL-type instruction at all. *Executive Order 665 (EO665)* (CSU, 1997), which took effect in 1998, decreed that most entering freshman students must take the English Placement Test (EPT), which assesses reading and writing skills through multiple choice questions and a timed essay. Students may be exempted by system-wide designated scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) and American College Test (ACT) verbal tests, Advanced Placement testing, and Early Assessment Program tests. Although students have recently been allowed to self-identify on the EPT as to whether English is their first language, these data are retained by the Educational Testing Service (ETS), the administrators of the test. Only a few campuses that do their own additional testing have this information.

If students do not receive sufficient scores on the EPT, they are usually required to take part in preparatory campus programs or activities. With strong guidelines provided by the Chancellor's Office, each CSU campus is allowed some flexibility to interpret the scores in its own way and to decide how to use them. On most campuses, students scoring below the campus cut score for freshman composition are required to take a CSU developmental writing course or set of courses; sometimes this includes ESL courses prior to freshman composition, or it may be part of an ESL course sequence that is parallel to native-speaker courses, including freshman composition for non-native speakers. Most ESL professionals consider these ESL courses as developmental, not remedial, however, since the learners are acquiring a new language in contrast to obtaining remediation for a language they have already acquired. *EO665* also decrees that if students do not complete their remediation requirements within a specified period, that is, one academic year, they are to be administratively disenrolled from the CSU and may be asked to enroll in community college to complete their lower-division requirements. Since 1998 thousands of students have been disenrolled from the university for this reason.

[1]   Accountability Reporting for the CCCs is the response to accountability reporting required by Assembly Bill 1417.

At the time of this report, discussions about ESL learners occasionally occur in writing programs across the state. The CSU English Council, which consists of chairs and representatives from all English departments in the CSU system, meets biannually to discuss current developments and issues related to English literature and composition programs on each campus. In many cases, ESL Coordinators do not attend these council meetings since not all ESL programs are housed in English departments. ESL Coordinators on CSU campuses do not have a regulating body similar to the English Council. Although there have been system-wide workshops for faculty who teach in ESL, English for Academic Purposes, or Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL/TESL) programs, there are no regular meetings of ESL and TESOL faculty across the CSU system for the discussion of issues related to ESL composition and literature courses, assessment, placement, faculty training/development, and programmatic and curricular innovation.

University of California System

The UC system has ten campuses, eight of which have either ESL programs or writing programs that offer specialized instruction for ESL learners at the lower division undergraduate levels.[2] The UC mission, as laid out in the California Master Plan, includes acting as the primary academic agency for research as well as providing undergraduate, graduate and professional education. Because of the importance of both research and graduate education in the UC mission, some UC campuses first developed ESL programs primarily for international graduate students, especially before many children of first-generation immigrants and refugees reached college age in the 1980s.

Concerns about the assessment, placement, instruction and progress of undergraduate ESL learners at the UC campuses have historically been dealt with by the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). In 1985 the UC Chair of the University Committee on Preparatory Education[3] appointed ESL specialists from five of its campuses to a subcommittee on ESL. The charge of the ESL Subcommittee was to recommend entrance and exit level competencies for ESL courses at UC, to advise how and when students needing ESL should be identified, to determine what content of ESL courses should be eligible for baccalaureate credit, and to recommend what provisions should be made for ESL students to assist them in preparing to satisfy the University's Subject A requirement (now known as the Entry Level Writing Requirement).

---

[2] The University of California, San Francisco does not have an undergraduate program. The University of California, Merced recently opened and has not yet developed programs to address the needs of ESL learners.

[3] The committee was known in 1985 as UCUPRE.

Among the ESL Subcommittee's recommendations in a report to UCUPRE was that "UC Systemwide provide the leadership to ensure that each campus meets its educational and legal responsibilities to the immigrant ESL students it admits as well as to oversee ESL-related matters dealing with admission, transfer, and articulation." (University of California, 1989)

Subsequent to the report by the ESL Subcommittee, UCOPE formed an ESL Subcommittee consisting of members from the eight UC campuses with undergraduate programs. This committee meets annually to respond to requests concerned with ESL issues, including those related to CCC transfer students as well as to entering freshmen. Recent discussions have focused on how to place and instruct the long-term immigrant and American-born students who receive ESL designations on their Analytical Writing Placement Examinations (AWPE).

The Survey

T he report that follows is addressed to a number of different groups concerned with higher education in California. While it was produced to address the particular concerns of the CCC Board of Governors, the concerns of the Board are shared by a great many others, both within the CCC system and beyond it. The problems facing ESL learners affect not only their ability to be successful within or transfer to other public institutions of higher education, but also their ability to fully participate in and contribute to the social and economic well-being of the State of California. It is with this broader perspective in mind that we recommend that this report, its findings, and its recommendations be shared with faculty, staff, and administration in all three segments of public higher education in California (CCC, CSU, UC), intersegmental groups (ICAS, ICC, IMPAC), California professional organizations concerned with the specific needs of ESL learners (CATESOL, CABE, ECCTYC), legislators and other governmental entities (CPEC, CDE), and our colleagues in K-12 education, where many ESL learners begin their education in the United States.

Survey Design and Administration

The online survey used to gather information for this report was designed in extensive consultation with the Director of the UC, Santa Barbara, Social Science Survey Center. The survey began with a section about the respondent's background, followed by 87 questions divided into these categories:

◆ Identification of ESL Learners (whether they self-select or are identified in some way such as by placement testing),

◆ Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners (what assessment and/or placement instruments are used and who determines scores and placement),

- Range of Courses for ESL Learners (what courses are offered, how many levels, and whether they are credit bearing),

- Course Completion Policies Related to ESL Learners (whether students can repeat or challenge requirements for ESL courses, and whether they must complete ESL courses before obtaining credit in other courses), and

- Student Support Services for ESL Learners (whether and what kinds of support services exist specifically for ESL learners).

Although many of the questions simply called for multiple-choice responses, each of the categories also included numerous opportunities for open-ended comments about individual programs and practices. In some cases, the same questions were asked of respondents from CCCs, CSUs, and UCs, while in other cases, slightly different questions were asked of respondents in one or more of the three segments in order to reflect known differences in structure across the segments. The entire survey can be found in Appendix A-1 of this report.

Because of the limited scope and funding of this project, as well as limitations of the survey data, the project was unable to accomplish a number of desirable tasks:

- It did not address the sixth objective of our original proposal, to determine the types of data on ESL learners that are collected and reported, and the ways in which they are gathered, both while the students are enrolled in ESL courses and after they complete ESL coursework. Available data were too difficult to obtain across campuses, which was a finding in itself.

- It did not distinguish between credit and noncredit programs for the CCCs.

- It did not distinguish between international and immigrant populations since survey respondents could not provide differentiated data.

- It did not include students enrolled in UC or CSU Intensive English Programs, which are often administered by Continuing Education or Extension programs and serve nonmatriculant international students.

- It did not study vocational ESL issues although this topic is mentioned in some areas of the report.

Prior to administration of the survey, which was initially administered in late April 2005, members of the Task Force and other ESL professionals identified contacts at each college and university who could best complete it. Committee members made individual follow-up contact to encourage completion of the survey during the summer and again in late September 2005.

The Survey Respondents

Of the 109 CCCs, representatives from 61 (56%) completed the survey. Twenty-four of the responses are from small colleges, 20 from average-sized colleges, and 17 from large colleges. Twenty-seven of the colleges are in areas with low population density (rural), while 14 are from high population density areas (urban); the remainder are located in areas that are hard to characterize as either high or low density (urban or rural) (CCC System Office, 2003). Of the 23 CSUs, 12 responded. Two were rural campuses, five were urban campuses, and five were difficult to categorize. Of the ten UC campuses, the eight that have ESL programs were asked to complete the survey, all of whom did so.[4] For a summary of information about the respondents' positions, their length of time in those positions, and their professional degrees, please see Appendix A-2.

The following four sections of this report summarize and discuss the survey responses, which offer descriptive, comparative, and evaluative information about ESL issues within and across the three postsecondary education systems. These survey findings provide one view of the many differences in the ways that our colleges and universities respond to ESL learner needs through programs, courses and support services—differences that arise in part from such variables as where a campus is located geographically (for example, urban vs. rural), the size of the institution, the cultural and linguistic backgrounds of the student populations it serves, and the particular needs, both academic and vocational, of these populations.

Yet another perspective on the great diversity of our California college and university systems in responding to ESL issues, together with some of the reasons for this diversity, can be gained through profiles of individual campuses. To give the readers of this report a more holistic sense of the variation among institutions than what can be provided by the discrete categories in the survey findings, Appendix B offers profiles of seven campuses with ESL programs: four from the CCC system, two from the CSU system and one from the UC system.

---

[4]   As noted previously, there are no ESL programs at the UC Merced and San Francisco campuses.

Survey Findings and Recommendations

Identification of ESL Learners

Central to the ability to examine issues concerning the progress of ESL learners in college and university level work is the identification of ESL learners. Identification of a person as a second language learner of English is a complicated issue. Identification can be internal, i.e., a person self-identifies as a second language learner of English, or external, i.e., an evaluation of the person's language abilities provides such a designation. At times, the internal identification does not match the external. For example, a person who immigrates to the United States at the age of twelve may develop an oral fluency and acculturation such that s/he no longer perceives herself as a second language learner of English. However, a placement test or an informal assessment written in class at a college or university may indicate that she continues to demonstrate deficiencies in writing that are typical of a second language learner of English. Another complication is the issue of time. Does a person remain a second language learner of English for his/her entire life? If no, what is the demarcation that indicates one no longer needs to retain that label? In a college or university setting, is a student still a second language learner of English once he/she is no longer enrolled in an ESL course?

Initial Identification

In the majority of community colleges, self-identification is the primary tool for identifying ESL learners. At two-thirds of the colleges responding, entering freshmen ESL learners identify themselves either through a check-box on an application or through the selection of a placement test. This identification is further bolstered by the results on placement tests. A quarter of the colleges use visa information to help identify international student ESL learners. However, intake practices vary. One college reported that any student who

graduated from a United States high school was designated a native speaker, regardless of how long he/she had been in the United States. Another college indicated that any student who indicated he or she spoke a language in addition to English was designated as ESL.

The process of self-identification indicates problems with accurately counting ESL learners. Some respondents indicated that the stigma attached to being in ESL, particularly for students who feel they have already completed their ESL work in high school, prompts students to self-identify as native speakers. In addition, several respondents commented on the problems that face generation 1.5 students. Culturally, these students are not ESL learners. However, results on placement tests show that they have ESL features in academic writing and reading. As a result, generation 1.5 students do not fit neatly in either the traditional ESL or native-speaker categories.

At CSU, freshmen, when taking the EPT, can self-identify as second language users of English. This self-identification shows students' language backgrounds but not whether they have ESL problems. Only a few CSU campuses make use of the self-identification data that are reported along with EPT scores, and other steps, to help identify ESL students. Given this situation, at CSU entering freshmen ESL learners self-identify primarily through selection of ESL-specific courses. A fifth of the universities also identify ESL learners through placement testing. For the UC, entering freshmen may be identified as ESL learners when they take the UC Systemwide AWPE. All entering freshmen must take this exam unless exempted on the basis of scores from other examinations, including Advanced Placement, SAT Writing, and the International Baccalaureate (IB). On the UC AWPE, readers may give an "E" designation for essays of students with non-passing scores that exhibit non-native English linguistic or rhetorical features contributing to the non-passing score. As will be discussed later, on most UC campuses with ESL programs, these essays are later reread and student biographical data considered for placement purposes.

Table 1. How ESL Learners Are Initially Identified[*]

	CCC	CSU[**]	UC[**]
Self ID: application	60.4%	0.0%	42.9%
Self ID: placement test they choose to take	66.0%	0.0%	14.3%
Self ID: other means	15.1%	55.6%	0.0%
Placement test	43.4%	22.2%	71.4%
Visa data	15.1%	11.1%	14.3%

Biographical data	24.5%	0.0%	14.3%
Combination	37.7%	22.2%	57.1%
Other	18.9%	33.3%	14.3%

* Respondents could select multiple categories
** Applies only to entering freshmen

On-going Identification

Once ESL learners are identified, however, the process of tracking them to provide longitudinal information is affected by ongoing identification. As was asked above, do colleges and universities use the initial identification of ESL learners as the basis for tracking, or are students tagged as ESL learners only by the courses in which they enroll? The practice of identifying ESL learners at the CSU and UC may be indicative. For incoming freshmen, 75% of CSUs and 87.5% of UCs designate students as ESL learners. However, for students who transfer in, only 27.3% of CSUs and 14.3% of UCs make an ESL designation. The survey did not ask whether the identification of ESL learners included international students as well as other ESL students. Without an on-going designation of immigrant as well as international students as ESL learners, the tracking of students essential to obtaining data about the progress of ESL learners is impossible.

In addition, it is clear that data collection specifically about ESL learners is lacking. Only 60% of the CCCs indicated that they collected specific data on ESL learners. Only 2 CSU campuses and half of the UC campuses indicated that they gather information specifically about ESL learners. At the CCCs, progress of ESL students is only monitored on a course-by-course basis, if at all. Only 5% indicated monitoring progress beyond the course level. For all three segments, information about the number of international students is collected and maintained. However, not all international students speak English as a second language.

Table 2. Progress Tracking Of Freshmen ESL Students*

	CCC	CSU	UC
Progress not tracked	38.3%	41.7%	12.5%
Progress completing ESL courses tracked	56.7%	*	62.5%
Progress completing other writing requirements tracked	5.0%	*	25.0%

* These questions were not asked of CSU respondents

Recommendation

1. The CCC and CSU should consider the thoughtful implementation of an ESL-identifier, perhaps similar to the UCs "E" designation, for the purposes of helping to identify ESL learners before classes begin and for longitudinal tracking of ESL learner progress in each system.

Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners

California Community Colleges

Assessment and placement are inextricably tied to the issue of identification since in all three segments these are the processes by which a large number of students are identified as second language learners of English. In *Issues in Basic Skills Assessment and Placement in the California Community Colleges* (ASCCC, Fall 2004), the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges highlighted issues of concern about current processes for assessment and placement of ESL learners in the community colleges. As a central issue in assessment, the paper reviews the different types of tests used for assessment. These tests can be divided into two types: objective and subjective. Objective tests

In a survey conducted for the aforementioned paper, colleges reported that students generally self-selected their assessment test with no guidance from counselors or other college staff.

are generally multiple-choice tests, where students choose an answer from a given list. Subjective tests require student responses that evaluators score using established criteria. Writing assessment theory favors the use of subjective tests such as writing samples or oral interviews. While writing samples are used more often in community college assessment for ESL learners than for native speakers, fewer than 40% of CCCs employ a writing sample citing the expenditure of money and time needed to evaluate the samples. Validation of tests is also an issue. In recent years, the fluctuations in community college funding have resulted in the elimination of research capabilities at many colleges. As a result, many colleges lack the ability to perform the validation of tests and the correlation to ESL programs and courses.

Appropriate placement in the CCCs is dependent on accurate assessment, and herein lies another problem. In a survey conducted for the aforementioned paper, colleges reported that

students generally self-selected their assessment test with no guidance from counselors or other college staff. Given their existing problems with English, many ESL learners mistakenly took the "English" assessment as opposed to the "ESL" assessment. In addition, the stigma attached to "ESL" prompted some students to take the "English" assessment in order to avoid placement into ESL courses. An examination of the ESL placement tests used at community colleges showed that slightly less than 25% of the colleges did not provide a separate testing instrument for ESL learners.

The survey for this report confirms the findings of this early paper. Of the CCCs responding, 80% reported that students self-selected their placement test. Almost 80% reported that they used commercially available assessment tests, none of which require a writing sample. Forty-two percent reported a college-developed test, most of which are writing samples. Many colleges reported using the Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA), which is on the statewide approved list of ESL assessment instruments. While several of these colleges reported dissatisfaction with the ability of the CELSA to discriminate between courses within their programs, they cited adoption of the test because of the relatively lower cost and the fact that statewide approval removed one obstacle to local validation.

At many CCCs, ESL placements are advisory and can be challenged. The challenge process can take the form of an additional writing assessment or a waiver in which students acknowledge that by ignoring the college's placement recommendation, they may not succeed in their class of choice. While ESL courses often serve as the prerequisites for enrollment in English, the CCCs do not impose a time frame within which ESL coursework must be completed. In addition, of the three quarters of CCC respondents who indicated the existence of prerequisites, fully 7/8 (82.5%) indicated that students could challenge the prerequisite for a course. Many campuses in fact choose to include the requisite courses as a "recommended preparation" rather than a "prerequisite." At this campus, as at other campuses, the final disposition is made by the ESL faculty, sometimes in conjunction with individual counselors, English faculty, and/or administrators.

Repeatability of ESL courses is also related to the completion of prerequisites. While three quarters of the CCC respondents said that students could repeat courses, the particular conditions under which this is possible remain to be defined more clearly. Given that some ESL students need to repeat a course in order to achieve a level of competency prior to enrollment in the next course in a sequence, this topic warrants further investigation.

Since many courses, and many degree programs, have no English prerequisite, students may continue in their programs of study at the same time they are enrolled in the ESL program. Depending on the language requirements of the field or how impacted the program is, however, some degree or certificate programs (such as those in health-related areas) require

an advanced level of English. Students may meet the English requirements at the same time they are enrolled in the program.

California State University

Within the CSU system, entering freshmen take the EPT as an assessment of their language ability. This test is taken by all students and makes no accommodation for non-native English learners. Only 27.3% of respondents indicated that an additional placement test specifically for second language learners of English is employed in the assessment process. However, on some campuses the additional placement test is taken only by international students. When immigrant students are offered a supplemental test, universities depend on self-selection, ESL specialists, and other college staff equally to refer students to the supplemental test. With regard to the EPT, at five campuses, students are placed into courses by cut scores alone. At three colleges, tests are also evaluated by readers, which allows for better discrimination between native speakers and second language learners of English. At three colleges, a combination of self-identification and cut score is used to place students into ESL courses. One college reported that all freshman composition courses had students write a diagnostic essay in the first class session. On this campus, essays with possible ESL markers are evaluated by ESL specialists, and students are directed to other courses as appropriate. With the implementation of regulations governing remediation, students who achieve low scores on the EPT have one year to remediate before being redirected to a community college to complete remediation in English and mathematics before being readmitted to a CSU. International students may receive additional advisement during their orientation process. The number of students placed into ESL classes varies significantly among the campuses, from 50 to 650.

For students transferring from a CCC, the assumption at most CSUs is that fulfillment of GE Breadth or an Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) pattern indicates that a student has achieved the academic writing proficiency needed for upper division work. However, results on campus-specific junior-level writing proficiency exams[5] may indicate that a student continues to manifest significant second-language writing problems. Since research has shown that attainment of academic fluency in English can take many years, this is not unexpected.

---

[5] Examples of campus-specific exams meeting the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) include the Junior English Proficiency Test (JEPET), and Writing Proficiency Assessment (WPA).

University of California

At UCs, each individual campus has a placement process for students who have received "E" designations on the AWPE. As described previously, the "E" designation is given to non-passing essays when non-native English features have contributed to the non-passing score. Two of the UC campuses that do not have ESL programs use only a numerical score assigned by readers for the AWPE essays for placement into writing programs even though these campuses have either special sections for non-native English speakers or support courses in which students can electively enroll. On five of the eight campuses, ESL or writing program faculty re-read the "E"-designated examinations to make placement decisions into either ESL or mainstream courses.

Within mainstream composition programs, students may be directed to writing courses specifically targeted to second language learners of English; respondents indicate that many "E"-designations are now for generation 1.5 students, who have received most or all of their education in the United States. Only four of the eight campuses report that the review of "E" examinations is performed by ESL specialists. In addition to use of the AWPE, some campuses also administer campus-developed assessments in reading, grammar, and listening and use these results to place students into ESL courses.

At UC campuses with ESL programs, students must enroll in and complete the ESL courses into which they have been placed. Each campus has its own procedures whereby a student can request to have his/her placement reviewed. UC campuses typically afford students one or two years to successfully complete a writing course at the level of Subject A. Those identified on writing tests as needing ESL instruction are usually given additional time to make up their writing deficiency to allow for ESL courses. Once students actually enroll in ESL or writing programs, seven of the eight campuses track their progress, either through the program or by other means.

As with the CSUs, most UCs do not assess incoming CCC transfers for English language proficiency. Only one campus indicated an active assessment and tracking of the progress of ESL transfers.

The UC and CSU systems impose no explicit requirement for English-language competency except for international students, who are often required to pass the TOEFL exam at a certain minimal level. Some do, however, require that students meet a minimum standard of reading and writing proficiency before they may enroll in regular credit-bearing courses.

Recommendations

1. To encourage students to take the appropriate assessment exams and courses, school and college administrators, counselors and faculty should consider ways to mitigate the stigma of taking ESL courses.

2. Faculty working across all segments should re-examine ESL assessment procedures at the community colleges to provide a better transition for transfer students into the CSU and UC. One way to achieve this may be by reviewing assessment practices at CCCs so that direct assessment with writing samples becomes more common.

3. Effective ESL identification, assessment, and placement procedures at UC and CSU campuses should be summarized so that other campuses can easily learn about them.

4. Each segment should provide a formal organization of ESL Coordinators to meet and discuss identification, assessment and placement issues along with other matters.

ESL Courses and Programs

This section discusses survey findings about ESL courses offered by CCC, CSU, and UC campuses to provide a systematic and comprehensive overview. The topics include the following: 1) general background on existing ESL courses; 2) areas emphasized by existing ESL courses; 3) the number of students placed into ESL courses; 4) ways of meeting students' needs when no courses are available; 5) new courses that are needed; and 6) evaluation/assessment of courses and programs. In addition, data on CCC ESL courses obtained from the CCC System Office Management Information Systems Datamart are included.

Range of Campuses Offering ESL Courses

Of those who responded, almost all CCC campuses (98%) report having ESL classes and most (83%) of the CSU campuses report having such courses. It is important to note, however, that those CSUs (46%) that did not respond to our survey may very well be those that do not have classes specially designed for ESL learners. While all of the UC campuses report offering ESL classes, on at least two of the campuses these courses are not separate and required courses for ESL writers, rather, they are special optional ESL sections of a course, such as the pre-freshman-level writing course, which ESL writers may opt to enroll in if they wish. Overall, ESL courses are offered less frequently by CSUs than by CCCs and UCs.

Where ESL Courses are Housed

Where an ESL program is housed may affect its visibility and its accessibility to students and others on campus who may wish to use its resources. Survey results show that ESL programs are housed in and ESL courses are offered by a variety of campus departments on college and university campuses.

CCC respondents report offering ESL courses through diverse departments and programs, most frequently through ESL departments or programs (47 CCCs) but also sometimes through English departments (14 CCCs), "other" departments or programs (16 CCCs), and least frequently, Developmental Studies departments and Learning Skills Centers (6 CCCs).

Possible advantages to having a separate ESL department are that students and faculty become more aware of the course offerings and that the program has greater status as an academic entity with full-time faculty. The assumption, further, is that when there is an ESL department or program, the campus administration and members of the campus community are more likely to work with the heads of these units when developing policies affecting ESL students and when addressing ESL issues.

Possible advantages to having a separate ESL department are that students and faculty become more aware of the course offerings and that the program has greater status as an academic entity with full-time faculty.

On CSU campuses, English departments are the most common academic home for ESL courses (7 campuses), followed by "other" departments/programs (3 campuses), and Linguistics departments (2 campuses). At CSUs, only one campus reports offering ESL courses through an ESL program/department. At UC campuses, writing programs are the departments or programs most frequently offering the ESL courses (5 of 8 campuses) with Linguistics departments and "other" being homes for ESL courses at the other three campuses.

In summary, at CCCs, ESL courses are mostly offered by ESL departments/programs, at CSU they are mostly offered by English departments, and at UC they are mostly offered by writing programs. Program size appears to be a major reason for having ESL departments or programs. That is, CCCs may be more likely to have separate ESL departments because they offer a greater number of ESL courses than do CSUs and UCs.

Student Populations Served by ESL Courses

Survey respondents were asked whether undergraduate ESL courses on their campuses are for freshmen, for both freshmen and upper-division students, or mostly for freshmen, with some or a few courses serving upper-division students. Only UC and CSU respondents answered this question because CCCs do not have upper division courses. Four UC campuses report that all courses serve either freshmen only or mostly freshmen. While half of CSUs report that ESL courses are for freshmen only or mostly for freshmen, the other half report that ESL courses serve both freshmen and upper-division students or that some courses serve freshmen and some serve upper division students. In summary, the majority of UC courses specially designed for ESL learners are for freshmen rather than upper-division students. Compared to UCs, a greater percentage of CSU campuses offer ESL courses that serve upper-division students. This difference is not surprising, given that CSUs have an upper-division writing requirement and, therefore, have a need to serve upper division students with identified ESL needs.

Credit for ESL Courses

The issue of whether ESL courses should be credit bearing is one that is often discussed by educators. Among CSU respondents, 50% report that all ESL courses are credit bearing, 40% report that some are credit bearing and 10% report that none are credit bearing. Among UC respondents, 71% state that all ESL courses are credit bearing and 29% report that none are credit bearing. Credit-bearing ESL courses at many UC and CSU campuses are clearly common. At least half of both UC and CSU respondents indicate that all of their ESL courses are credit bearing. We can conclude that many UC and CSU campuses recognize the academic nature of ESL courses and appropriately confer credit for these courses.

The discussion of credit-bearing ESL courses at CCCs is more complex because the student population at CCCs is more diverse in its educational goals. The CCC System Office Management Information Systems Datamart (Datamart) breaks down ESL courses as being credit or noncredit and indicates that some colleges offer both credit and noncredit ESL courses, and some only offer credit or noncredit, not both. Based on the Datamart, 84 of the 109 colleges report offering ESL courses for credit.

There is, however, an important distinction in credit courses for the CCCs. One type of credit course is labeled degree-applicable. This means that the course can be counted towards the attainment of an associate degree, usually as elective credit, but sometimes in fulfillment of a specific area of general education. Some courses are articulated to a CSU or UC for transferable-credit as well, usually as elective credit. ESL professionals and local curriculum committees have supported the designation of many intermediate and higher level ESL courses as degree-applicable since these courses meet the standards of academic

rigor defined in Title 5 regulation. Others, however, have argued that ESL courses must be considered part of the hierarchy of courses leading to English and thus be held to the Title 5 regulation. This regulation requires that courses more than one level below the first transferable-level English course may only receive credit which is non-degree applicable. These courses do not count towards attainment of an associate degree but do count towards the overall grade point average (GPA) and can be used in calculating full-time/part-time status for purposes of financial aid. Generally, non-degree-applicable courses are preparatory courses; they prepare students to take courses that are applicable towards the associate degree. Some educators at CCCs argue that non-degree-applicable preparatory courses, such as novice level ESL, should be noncredit. However, given that at the time of this report, credit courses receive almost twice the funding as noncredit at CCCs, there is incentive for colleges to make preparatory ESL courses non-degree-applicable credit-bearing.

In sum, half of CSUs and the majority of UCs report that all ESL courses are credit bearing and can be used towards the attainment of an undergraduate degree.

The majority of CCCs report offering ESL courses for credit, but the credit may be related to associate degree attainment or may mean that students can use the credits to achieve full- or part-time status. ESL courses in the CCCs may also be offered as non-credit bearing.

ESL Course Sequencing

When ESL students arrive at a campus, if there are ESL classes available, the question remains whether students will be expected to complete a specific sequence of courses in ESL. The survey shows that most campuses from all three sectors have ESL students take a specific sequence of ESL courses: 73% of CCCs, 70% of CSUs, and 83% of UCs.

We need to clarify that written comments on the survey suggest there may be flexibility in requirements to follow a sequence in programs on certain campuses. One respondent from a CCC writes, "ESL students are required to follow a sequence of courses,...but they may leave the ESL courses and take a test to get into English [department] classes, they may skip a level by retesting, and so forth."

Skill Areas of ESL Courses for Undergraduates

ESL classes in colleges and universities span a range of skills areas. To describe these skills, respondents were asked to select from the following nine items: writing, reading, reading/writing, pronunciation, listening, speaking, listening/speaking, multi-skill and grammar. Vocational content areas were not included in the list.

Fifty-nine respondents from CCC, nine from CSU and all eight from UC provided information about the types of courses offered on their campuses; the data are summarized in Table 3.

CCC respondents indicate that their ESL courses emphasize a wide variety of skill areas. Courses emphasizing listening/speaking are offered by the largest number of colleges (81%), followed by courses emphasizing writing (78%), reading (72%), grammar (71%), multi-skill (59%), pronunciation (58%), reading/writing (54%), speaking (27%) and listening (20%). In contrast, CSU courses emphasize a limited range of skill areas, primarily writing (67%) or reading/writing (56%) with far fewer campuses offering courses that emphasize grammar (33%), reading (22%), or multi-skill courses (22%). On the CSU respondents' campuses, ESL listening, speaking, and pronunciation courses are not offered. UC campuses offer a range of courses similar to those offered by CSUs but very different from those offered by CCCs. At UC campuses, courses emphasizing writing are identified just as frequently as those emphasizing grammar (63%). Since respondents were not offered the option of selecting a writing/grammar combination, it is not known if the five UC campuses noting they emphasize grammar were identifying separate grammar courses, or if the two skills were covered in the same courses. Besides writing and grammar, UC respondents also indicate that their courses emphasize reading (38%), multi-skill (38%), reading/writing (25%), speaking (25%), and pronunciation (13%).

To summarize, CCCs offer a wide range of ESL courses. In contrast, most CSU campuses offer a narrow range of ESL courses, primarily writing or reading/writing, and UC campuses emphasize ESL writing and grammar. None of the UCs offers a listening course, and none of the CSUs responding offers listening or speaking courses. The emphasis on writing at CSUs and UCs most likely stems from the need to help students succeed in freshman composition courses. Since there are students at CCCs who are striving to achieve vocational certificates or prepare for citizenship rather than seeking college degrees, not all of them need to reach a freshman composition level of writing. Also, since CCCs allow any adult to enroll in ESL courses, some students arrive with much lower English skills at CCCs than at CSUs or UCs. Therefore, many CCC ESL students are likely to have needs that differ from those of students at CSUs and UCs, and the types of ESL courses offered to help students meet these varying needs logically differ.

Table 3. Kinds of Undergraduate ESL Classes Offered

	CCC (N=59)	CSU (N=9)	UC (N=8)
Listening/speaking	81%	0%	0%
Writing	78%	67%	63%
Reading	73%	22%	38%
Grammar	71%	33%	63%

Multi-skill	59%	22%	38%
Pronunciation	58%	0%	13%
Reading/writing	54%	56%	25%
Speaking	27%	0%	25%
Listening	20%	0%	0%

Levels of Instruction among ESL Courses

Community colleges offer the largest range of levels of courses for ESL learners in all language skill areas of the three higher education systems. While all three segments offer a wide range of levels of writing courses, only CCCs offer a wide range of levels in the other skill areas, including reading, listening, speaking, grammar, and multi-skills. CCCs report offering from one to six or more levels of ESL writing instruction, CSUs report offering from two to four levels of ESL writing instruction including upper division ESL writing, and UCs report offering from one to five levels of ESL writing instruction but with more than half of UCs reporting offering only one level of ESL writing.

Since the overall aim of the survey was not to examine all aspects of writing instruction, detailed data about this topic were not collected; however, based on the collective knowledge of Task Force members, the Task Force can offer some insight into which of the following ESL courses are offered in each segment: (1) beginning/intermediate writing, (2) preparation for freshman composition, (3) freshman composition, or (4) upper division writing. Many CCCs offer ESL writing courses of type one through three, some CSUs offer ESL writing instruction of types two through four, and all UCs offer ESL writing instruction of type two and some also offer type four. Some of the CSU and UC courses are special ESL sections of writing courses such as freshman composition, while others are separate ESL courses, such as courses that prepare students to take freshman composition.

Community colleges offer the largest range of levels of courses for ESL learners in all language skill areas of the three higher education systems.

Just as the kinds of ESL courses offered at CSUs and UCs may vary from those offered at CCCs due to the emphasis at universities on helping students succeed in freshman composition, the number of levels of ESL instruction offered may also be related to this

emphasis. At CSUs, reading and writing assessments are the focus for the EPT taken by freshmen, and upper division CSU students must meet writing requirements. A similar emphasis on reading and writing assessment of freshmen occurs at UCs.

Class Size of ESL Courses

Class size of ESL courses is an important consideration for various reasons, including the amount of instructor feedback required to help ESL students and the amount of class time each student has to participate. At CCCs, class size of ESL writing courses ranges from 15 to 38 per class, with seven campuses reporting a class size of 30. At UC, class size of ESL writing courses ranges from 14 to 22, with 4 campuses (50%) reporting a size of 18. It can be seen that across the college-level system, class size of writing courses specially designed for ESL learners varies significantly from a minimum of 14 to a maximum of 38. Class size may be smaller at UCs than at CCCs since students are often enrolled in ESL sections of preparatory composition courses involving longer essays and frequent detailed feedback from teachers (this is true at both CSUs and UCs). When ESL courses involve mainly composition or essay writing, smaller class sizes allow for the instructor to give detailed enough and sufficient feedback to the students to make a difference in their writing. Due to the complexity of the online survey design, the question about class size of ESL courses was inadvertently omitted in the survey completed by CSU respondents.

Methods Used to Address ESL Learners' Needs Without Specially-Designed Courses

In spite of the prevalence of ESL learners on California college and university campuses, not all institutions offer specially-designed courses to address their needs. Colleges and universities were asked how they served the needs of their ESL learners in the absence of such courses. Four or fewer campuses from each segment responded to this question. The CCC respondents indicate that learning skills centers and tutoring centers meet these students' needs. The CSU respondents indicate with equal frequency that tutoring, language/computer/writing labs, and/or drop-in learning skill centers are offered to help these students. The UC respondents (probably the two UC campuses that said that they do not offer separate and required ESL courses but rather optional courses for ESL writers) indicate that tutoring is the only form of help for their students. While all of the CSU and UC respondents indicate that there are services available when ESL courses are not offered, one of the four CCC respondents indicates that none of these services are available to meet ESL students' needs. While it is clear that support services such as tutoring, labs (language, computer or writing labs), and learning skills centers try to meet ESL students' language needs when ESL classes are not offered, details about such services are lacking. Significantly, it is not known if support services alone can adequately meet the language

needs of ESL students. Nor is it known if students use these services without referral by a faculty member. Finally, it would be useful to know if students use these services primarily to complete a specific task such as revising a paper (occasional drop-in help) or whether these services provide systematic, weekly work on improving students' use of English.

Need for Additional ESL Courses

The need for additional ESL courses or sections of existing courses was expressed by respondents from all three segments of public higher education. As is shown in Table 4, the majority of respondents from both CCC (64%) and from CSU (60%) think that additional courses are needed. However, at UC, the responses are evenly divided between those who think the currently offered courses meet students' needs (43%) and those who think new courses are needed (also 43%). At CCC, close to one-fifth of colleges report that additional sections of classes already offered are needed.

Table 4. Campuses Indicating Additional ESL Courses are Needed to Meet ESL Students' Needs

	CCC (N=63)	CSU (N=10)	UC (N=7)
Courses currently offered meet students' needs	19%	30%	43%
Additional sections of classes offered needed	18%	10%	14%
Additional courses needed	64%	60%	43%

Program Evaluation

Ongoing program evaluation is important to the success of academic programs and ensures that these programs continue to meet students' needs. Campuses report a variety of ways in which they engage in program evaluation. For this report, only methods identified by more than 20% of respondents are included. CCCs primarily engage in program self-evaluation with almost 80% identifying this practice. CSU campuses report engaging in program self-evaluation or "other" methods. These methods include outcomes assessment such as portfolio assessment of student writing. UC campuses report having an outside evaluator participate in the program evaluation or engaging in program self-evaluation. None of the CSU campuses and very few (less than 5%) of CCCs have had an outside evaluator evaluate the program. This is one area where responses were quite varied between the three segments.

Summary of Major Findings about ESL Courses and Programs

The majority of CCC and CSU and all of the UC campuses offer courses specially designed for ESL learners. However, it must be kept in mind that responses on this question were not received from 46% of CSU campuses and these may be the very campuses that do not have courses for ESL learners. At CCC, CSU, and UC campuses, ESL courses are offered by a variety of departments and programs, for example English, writing, linguistics, learning skills, or ESL.

At the majority of UC campuses, undergraduate courses specially designed for ESL learners are predominantly designed to serve freshmen rather than upper-division students, while at CSU campuses these courses serve both freshmen and upper-division students. Regarding credit, at many CSU and most UC campuses, ESL courses are credit bearing and count towards a degree. The situation at the CCCs is more complicated; some courses are not offered for credit (noncredit); some courses are offered for credit applicable towards a degree; and some courses are offered for credit that cannot be applied towards a degree. A high percentage of campuses from CCC, CSU and UC expect students to complete a specific sequence of courses designed for ESL learners rather than just a single course.

CCCs offer a wide range of ESL courses (e.g. listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar) while most CSU and UC campuses offer a narrow range of ESL courses, primarily writing or reading/writing or grammar. CCCs offer, by far, the largest range of levels of instruction for ESL learners in *all* skill areas among the three segments. Further, while all three segments offer a range of levels of writing courses, only CCCs offer a range of levels of instruction in the other skill areas, including reading, listening, speaking, grammar, and multi-skills.

Class size of writing courses specially designed for ESL learners varies significantly across the college-level system with UCs reporting smaller classes (14-22) than CCCs (15-38). However, we were unable to gather any data on class size in the CSU system.

If no ESL courses are offered at an institution, support services such as drop-in tutoring and language/computer/writing labs try to meet ESL learners' needs. However, it is not known if these services adequately meet ESL learners' needs or if students use them without referral by a faculty member.

The majority of CCC and CSU respondents and some UC respondents report that additional ESL courses are needed on their campuses to meet ESL learners' needs. Many CCCs report needing additional sections of classes already offered. The need for additional sections of existing classes is less pronounced at CSU and UC campuses.

CCC, CSU, and UC campuses report a variety of ways to engage in program evaluation. At UC campuses, it is fairly common to have an outside evaluator participate in the evaluation,

while at CSU and CCC it is much more common for a program to undergo a program self-evaluation.

Recommendations

1. Because not all CCCs, CSUs, and UCs offer special courses for ESL students, including long-term California residents who still have persistent ESL problems, each campus should be encouraged and provided resources to assess whether their students have ESL problems pertaining to use of academic English.

2. Campuses need to identify multiple ways to help ESL students, including designing ESL programs and courses, hiring instructors trained to teach ESL, offering or improving ESL tutoring, offering mini-courses that address ESL problems, and counseling ESL students.

3. Second language researchers have emphasized that it takes many years to become proficient in academic uses of English; therefore, ESL classes should be offered both to entering and transfer students.

4. When ESL courses involve mainly academic writing, class size needs to be kept low in order for instructors to give quality feedback to students.

5. Campuses should investigate the constraints on ESL course repeatability and length of time allowed to meet requirements.

6. Because of the academic nature of higher level ESL courses, the degree applicability of these courses needs to be recognized.

Student Support Services for ESL Learners

California Pathways defines support practices as "any of the means by which a school or institution provides direct assistance to students" (ICAS, 2001). Support services take a variety of forms from simple course progress reports to specially-designed programs, orientations, counseling, bilingual advising, tutorial services, writing centers, learning resource centers, or mentoring opportunities.

As was noted in *California Pathways*, student support services may be more or less effective depending upon many factors. In cases where ESL students are identified only when enrolled in ESL classes, there are a large number of ESL learners never recognized, so special student services programming has not been developed for them on many campuses. Even when identified, ESL learners may be subdivided into smaller groups served in different ways and in different offices. In contrast, international student services are highly visible because the services are centralized in international student offices.

To tap into ESL specialists' perceptions of student support services on their campuses, respondents were asked not only to identify support services for non-native English speaking resident students, who constitute the majority of ESL learners across our institutions, but also for international students (a smaller population on most campuses). They were further asked to identify not only whether certain support services existed but to evaluate the effectiveness of these services.

Orientation/Initial Advising

Orientation and initial advising are viewed as extremely important services to support ESL learners. As noted earlier in this document, navigating the placement and assessment world can be very challenging to ESL students. If students are not clearly identified as ESL nor have any understanding of how to interpret their test scores, they risk improper placement and inadequate instruction at an institution. Respondents in all three segments were asked to indicate whether or not orientation/initial advising services specifically for ESL learners are provided to residents and immigrants as well as to international non-native English-speaking students.

Because of the federal mandates, special funding, and the needs of short-term visitors to California from outside the United States, it is not surprising that all three institutions provide specific orientations for international students. In the CCC, where the number of international students varies greatly, orientation and initial advisement are offered about as frequently for international learners as other ESL learners. However, in the CSU and UC, specially tailored orientation and initial advisement are offered more frequently for international students than for other ESL learners. This is most pronounced in the CSU, where most of the campuses offer these types of services to international students but less than a third to other ESL learners (See Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5. Orientation Services Specifically for Resident/Immigrant ESL Learners on Campus

	CCC	CSU	UC	TOTAL
YES Count/Percentage	41/65%	3/27%	3/38%	47/57%
NO Count/Percentage	22/35%	8/73%	5/63%	35/43%
TOTAL	63/100%	11/100%	8/100%	82/100%

Table 6. Orientation Services Specifically for International ESL Learners on Campus

	CCC	CSU	UC	TOTAL
YES Count/Percentage	39/64%	11/98%	5/71%	55/69%
NO Count/Percentage	22/36%	1/8%	2/29%	25/31%
TOTAL	61/100%	12/100%	7/100%	80/100%

At the CCC, the range of orientation/advising services available varies from not having any separate sessions to other formats including special sessions for ESL learners separate from those for native speakers, special sessions for international students but not for other ESL learners, computer orientations designed for ESL learners, and bilingual orientations.

CCC orientations specifically for ESL students are conducted by ESL Coordinators and faculty, by counselors, or by both working together. Students who receive financial aid or qualify for Equal Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) are usually required to meet with a counselor and set up an educational plan. Sometimes these counselors are fluent in the student's first language. One CCC campus has a particularly elaborated orientation system in which one counselor is specifically assigned to the ESL student population. He advises for education plans, takes students on campus tours, answers student questions, and makes students aware of resources that can assist them with their educational goals.

At some CSUs, only international students are identified as ESL learners; other students with ESL needs are not offered a special orientation or advising. At many CSUs and UCs, ESL orientations are almost exclusively conducted through the international student office, though at one UC, the Services for Transfer and Re-entry Students (STARS) conducts them. Sometimes ESL Coordinators attend the sessions organized by the international student office to give brief presentations on assessment, ESL courses and/or resources available on campus. At other times, the office itself presents this information.

The overall rating for these orientation services for ESL learners (both resident/immigrant and international) is generally positive in the UCs and CCCs, with 60% of the respondents rating them good or excellent and less positive for the CSU, with only 22% rating them as good or excellent. One theme that was repeated at all levels was the perceived greater attention paid to international students in our systems. International student orientations are often required, while those for other ESL learners are not. Federal requirements and higher fees/tuition for international students clearly influence this situation.

Though some colleges are providing bilingual orientations, they seem to be the exception rather than the rule. *California Pathways* suggests that second language orientations have interpreters present and that handbooks and videos be available in students' first languages (ICAS, 2001). The survey did not show that this is being followed, possibly due to the needed funding, especially on campuses where the number of language groups is large.

The results of students not having proper orientation and advisement in programs can be devastating. Without an orientation, ESL students may choose the incorrect ESL classes or no ESL classes at all; choose classes based on the advice of friends or family members whose information may be inaccurate; misunderstand the results of their assessment, become discouraged, never register for ESL classes and thus not establish any connection with the ESL program and advisors.

Counseling

California Pathways distinguishes the difference between advising, discussed in the previous section, and counseling, to be discussed in this one. Whereas advising helps students to select courses and fulfill academic requirements, counseling gives students guidance in dealing with not only academic issues but personal issues that arise during the education process.

Though some colleges are providing bilingual orientations, they seem to be the exception rather than the rule.

The survey shows there are marked perceived differences among the three systems in providing counseling specifically for ESL students and between the availability of counseling to international and to immigrant/resident students. Some of this is to be expected as some advanced proficiency ESL students may be adequately served by counseling services provided to non-ESL students on a campus. Nonetheless, 60% of CCCs offer ESL counseling to international students, but fewer than half report such a service for immigrant/resident students, many of whom could use it. Whereas over half the reporting CSUs provide counseling for international students, very few have ESL counseling for immigrants/residents. Counseling directed specifically to ESL students is offered to international students on only two UC campuses, one of which also provides counseling to immigrant/resident ESL students.

On CCC campuses, academic counseling of ESL students is sometimes provided by dedicated ESL counselors, but more often by general counseling staff with greater or lesser expertise

in dealing with specific ESL issues. ESL Coordinators and faculty also provide a great deal of counseling either through orientation sessions or informally in meetings with students. Comments suggest that the most common problem with counseling of ESL students is a counselor's unfamiliarity with ESL issues and/or with the campus's ESL program.

It should be noted that the responses to this question may be somewhat lower than expected because many ESL students may not be identified as ESL learners, and they may receive counseling through other programs on campus, for example, EOPS and Puente. These programs require students to meet with their counselors and often provide other support, such as workshops and tutoring.

Services for At-Risk Students

Many students considered "at-risk" come under this classification at least partly, if not largely, because of language proficiency issues. When asked whether or not these services on campus included specific ESL services, fewer than 50% of the respondents in all three segments indicated that such services are provided. The frequency of services seems to be greater in the CSUs (46%) than either the CCCs (33%) or the UCs (25%).

There are many different offices on campus that serve these students. EOPS offer counseling, often in the students' first language; peer advising; midterm progress reports or early warning reports; financial aid; textbook vouchers; early registration; special workshops; Summer Bridge programs; and the STEP program (UC). On one CCC campus, of the 1,505 students served by EOPS during a recent academic year, 425, or 28%, were in ESL classes. ESL instructors find great support from this program when their students have academic or behavioral challenges. Many former ESL students are peer counselors in the EOPS office.

Other programs include the Academic Advancement Program (UC), which offers a range of programs for ESL and non-ESL students; ESL learning communities; Puente; Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA); and CARE. One CSU campus respondent describes an especially effective summer program for at-risk students:

> EOP Summer Bridge offers ESL courses through the Learning Skills Center in an accelerated summer program. The program also provides tutoring, orientation, and social activities. In recent years, the majority of students in the program have been generation 1.5 long-term immigrants. During the fall, freshmen are placed into ESL learning communities.

More of this type of coordinated effort between ESL instructors and programs is needed to assure that at-risk students are identified and assisted early on in their college careers at all levels.

Tutoring/Learning Centers

Most campuses have created learning centers in which tutors and staff assist students with reviewing and reinforcing what students are learning in their courses. Sometimes these centers are dedicated to assisting ESL students; other times they are general learning centers for the campus which serve both native and non-native English speakers. These centers have various names (e.g., learning resource center, writing center, learning lab, tutorial center) and they may be rather basic or contain the latest high-tech equipment, software programs, web resources, and group and individual tutoring.

The results of the survey show that all three systems provide tutoring targeted specifically for ESL learners, both immigrant/resident and international. Tutoring services are provided more frequently for international students at the CSU than at other levels. However, 86% of the UC campuses provide tutoring services for immigrant/resident ESL learners, exceeding the other two systems by more than 15%. All three systems provide a range of tutoring services with some specialized tutors. One response from the CCC is particularly insightful about the range of lab activities that may occur:

> All ESL grammar/writing courses have optional paired lab courses in the learning center. All reading courses have mandatory lab hours. The tutorial center provides sessions on grammatical problems (for native speakers and ESL students). The tutorial center also provides conversation groups for ESL students. In addition, tutors provide individual help for ESL students.

The overall perceived effectiveness of such learning centers is mixed with the respondents from the CCCs feeling most positive (64% rated the centers as good to excellent). This compares to the UC rating of 50% being good to excellent. Of the seven CSU respondents (a lower number than the usual eleven or twelve), half rated the services as good and none as excellent (See Table 7).

Table 7. Effectiveness of Tutoring Services for ESL Learners

Rating	CC	CSU	UC
Excellent	24%	0%	33%
Good	40%	57%	17%
Average	24%	29%	17%
Below Average	2%	14%	17%
Poor	2%	0%	0%

Unable to Evaluate	7%	0%	17%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

Other comments point out significant problems with tutoring services, among them the inadequacy of tutor training; insufficient pedagogical grammar knowledge on the part of tutors, which is essential for ESL composition tutoring; and a high turn-over rate once tutors are trained. Scheduling of tutors is sometimes not effective because there are insufficient numbers of tutors later in the semester when they are most needed. Finally, there is insufficient funding for the tutoring/learning centers as a whole.

Outreach to Feeder High Schools and Transfer Services

To create a seamless flow of high school students to the CCCs, CSUs, and UCs, campus outreach and recruitment are very important. To facilitate this flow from CCCs to CSUs and UCs, transfer services, which refer to advisement and information students receive about transferring from one segment to another, are also needed. This section explores the types and quality of outreach and transfer services in all three segments.

All three segments reported perceived limited outreach services to ESL high school learners, with outreach from the UC being greatest.

All three segments reported perceived limited outreach services to ESL high school learners, with outreach from the UC being greatest. For the CCC, mostly staff and counselors visit high schools (10 respondents mentioned this), when they have time. Sometimes ESL faculty or ESL Coordinators visit schools. Placement tests are sometimes given at high schools as well.

One CCC comment is particularly informative about the importance of outreach staff given the stigma that certain high school students may feel, possibly generation 1.5 students, when being asked to take an ESL versus regular English test at a feeder high school:

> Our outreach department goes into our feeder high schools each spring to do placement testing at each site. Prior to the testing, they ask the seniors' instructors to determine which students should take the ESL placement test so that they know how many test forms to take to each site. For some students, taking the ESL test is not an issue; they self-identify as ESL. For others, however,

> this test might make them feel stigmatized, and they opt at the last minute to take the English placement instrument. Our outreach personnel are quite skilled at encouraging students to take the appropriate test instrument, and this type of one-on-one conversation is the most valuable outreach service they provide. Students, however, can take the test they want.

The outreach activities conducted by this CCC campus point to the crucial role that outreach counselors can have in guiding students to the appropriate test so that appropriate placement and instruction will take place at the college level.

Some CCC ESL programs have also started their own outreach efforts, bringing ESL learners to their campuses or their courses to ESL learners. One CCC has begun to teach ESL writing courses on a high school campus as part of their summer school program where students are able to get high school and college credit for participation. One of the CCC respondents also mentioned another vehicle for improving articulation among the segments as well as with K-12. California Partnership for Achieving Student Success (Cal-PASS) is a K-16 initiative which allows the educational institutions involved to analyze the student data provided, tracking student progress through the system.

In the survey, fewer CSU respondents described CSU outreach. However, one CSU respondent mentioned Summer Bridge and Step to College programs, although not specifically for ESL learners, as being helpful in guiding ESL learners to ESL classes. UC respondents mentioned two programs: Engaging Latino Communities for Education (ENLACE) and a high school teacher professional development project that has trained 4,000 high school teachers in several school districts in central and southern California.

Immigrant/resident and international ESL students may also need information about transferring between the different segments at different times. CCCs offer transfer services that may facilitate a student transferring from a CCC to a CSU or a UC. However, CSU students who are not able to pass developmental composition course requirements may need to transfer to a CCC, and UC students who change their majors may decide to transfer to a CSU.

The survey uncovered little awareness of transfer services for our students across systems, even though they are mandated. Only 19% of CCC respondents report transfer services for international ESL students, and a mere 13% for immigrant/resident ESL students. At CSU, where transfer services are offered for incoming transfer students, over 25% of respondents report transfer services specifically directed at international ESL students; but only 9% have such services for immigrants/residents. A comment by one CSU respondent shows what can happen when transfer students have been inadequately advised about language needs required in upper-division work:

> I know from conversations with faculty in the nursing department that they have upper-division ESL students, some of whom transferred, who are not passing their Nursing Board Exams. The number has increased over the years. The faculty believe it is due to language problems. I also have been told by faculty in social work that some students in social work are struggling with language problems; many of them were transfer students. The faculty members are trying to help these students but don't know what they can do.

The single UC campus indicating transfer services directed at ESL students offers those services to both international and immigrant/resident transfer students. The disparity between international and other ESL students, while not inconsequential, is thus not as marked as in some other areas.

In the case of both outreach efforts and transfer services, it is clear that more transfer counseling specifically directed toward ESL students and more sharing and/or collaboration among programs regarding outreach are needed to improve the flow of students between segments.

Other Services

Other services, such as disabled student services, financial aid, and job placement/career services are also very important to ESL students. Few colleges or universities have special services for ESL students who are disabled. Fourteen percent of the CCCs and UCs indicate that such services exist. None of the CSUs indicate knowledge of such specialized services for ESL learners. In reality, special services for disabled students are available for all students with disabilities[6]. One explanation for the limited services for ESL students is the complex testing required to qualify for these services. These tests are available in English and Spanish only, so students speaking another first language cannot be tested. Many times faculty observe that an ESL student appears to have a learning disability, but this cannot be documented through the testing process. Despite this, many ESL students at the CCC (as is probably the case in the CSUs and UCs) have been able to get the necessary doctor recommendation to receive special test accommodations.

Several colleges report that their ESL students are served by the office of disabled student services with sign language interpreters, note takers, and extra time and a quiet environment for test taking. Deaf students whose first language is American Sign Language (ASL) have been placed in ESL courses at the CCC level with some success. Unfortunately, the lowest level ESL classes at CCCs have occasionally become the place where disabled

---

[6] Services are offered through offices such as Disabled Student Services, Office of Special Services, or Disabled Students Programs and Services.

students who have no ESL issues are placed.

A small minority of campuses have financial aid services directed specifically at ESL students; no CSU respondent, only one from UC, and a mere 15% of CCC respondents report such a service. In a very few cases bilingual services or materials are offered to ESL students. This result is somewhat surprising as many urban campuses have many ESL students receiving financial assistance yet no targeted financial aid services to assist them. One community college provides positive support for these students as one respondent reflects:

> There are two financial aid techs that have specific hours for bilingual Spanish students. The Assessment Center also has a part-time bilingual person with specific hours; the Student Support Service has written in their grant a section specifically for ESL students.

Many campuses have career centers that serve non-ESL students. However, special job placement services for ESL students are offered by only 5 or 8% of the CCCs and none of the CSUs or UCs. ESL students may have their own networks of friends or relatives for sharing information about financial aid, employment opportunities and career options. Nevertheless, especially when students have a low proficiency in English, they would benefit from special services to meet their financial aid and job placement/career services needs.

The results also suggest that, overall, possibly because of the different funding base for international programs on college/university campuses, international students fare better in all three segments in the amount and quality of orientation, initial advisement, and ongoing counseling than other ESL students.

Summary of Major Findings about ESL Student Support Services

Survey results suggest that each segment appears to be stronger in some areas of ESL support than in others. The results also suggest that, overall, possibly because of the different funding base for international programs on college/university campuses, international students fare better in all three segments in the amount and quality of orientation, initial advisement, and ongoing counseling than other ESL students.

Another factor that may affect student support services is large influxes of immigrants inundating an institution that previously had sufficient and qualified support networks for native speakers but then became deficient in appropriate support staff and services for non-native speakers. For example, counseling services and staff may have been in place

since the founding of a campus and may not have adjusted to the changing needs of new immigrants from very different cultural backgrounds. Unpredicted changes such as these have affected the quality of support services on some campuses.

Slashed state budgets may be another factor explaining why student services are reduced for immigrant/resident students. These cuts may cause more serious problems for some segments than for others. For example, for a large urban CCC whose support networks are already quite sensitive to the needs of non-native English speakers, a budget cut can be much less devastating than to a CSU with faculty and staff less attuned to ESL learner needs. In contrast, orientations and advisement of F-1 international students mandated by federal law and funded by their higher tuition rates create a motivation for stronger and more consistent support of these students from the beginning to the end of their enrollment, especially post-9/11.

While it is important that support services are available to the small populations of international students, the vast majority of other ESL learners are perceived to be receiving less comprehensive support. These results, furthermore, suggest that communication between ESL programs and other support offices on campuses should be improved to make the most of what is available to immigrant/resident ESL learners.

Recommendations

1. Campuses should expand and adapt advisement for all groups of ESL learners.

2. Campuses should develop more effective ways to disseminate information about support services to ESL learners, such as online resources, handbooks, and CDs.

3. Campuses should consider a broad range of service delivery methods, such as bilingual assistance, more linguistic and cultural diversity among counselors, regular meetings to keep counselors aware of ESL learner needs, and mentoring programs in which new ESL students are paired with someone who speaks the same first language.

4. Campuses should call on ESL professionals as resources for transfer services, at-risk counseling, outreach, and job placement presentations.

5. Campuses should find or develop assessment instruments to identify learning disabilities among our ESL learners to better meet their special needs.

Conclusion and Recommendations

E SL learners are present on every campus of the three segments of public higher education in California. This is true whether or not an institution officially recognizes ESL learners on campus through programs and services designed for their special language needs. These students are varied and, partly for this reason, are not always readily identifiable. They range from international students and recently-arrived immigrants to long-term immigrants and those who are born in the United States into non-English linguistic communities. Many in the latter two categories comprise the group identified throughout this report as generation 1.5.

The language development needs of ESL learners must be addressed because their educational progress and success, or lack thereof, affect not only themselves but also their classmates, their instructors, their institutions, and ultimately the society at large. Those in positions to make decisions about institutional priorities need to recognize this situation and the fact that, based on current demographic data, the number of ESL learners in higher education in California will only continue to grow in the coming years.

In this report, the Task Force has described and documented survey responses from individual faculty and administrators familiar with ESL issues. These responses show the ongoing need for improved identification of ESL learners as they enter our systems; better processes for assessment and placement into language courses; ESL courses adequate in number, level, and breadth to serve students' academic needs; and student services to provide the support that will bolster the success of ESL learners.

Throughout the process of developing this report, the Task Force members have been enlightened and rejuvenated by their interactions with peers from the other segments. Task Force members have learned a great deal about their own and the other systems, and this knowledge has increased their understanding about how best to serve the needs of ESL learners as they move from one segment to another. Task Force members have also valued the opportunity to work with colleagues from other institutions within their segments. Whereas members recognized that differences probably existed between segments because of their differing missions, few were prepared for some of the striking differences that exist within each system.

The members of the Task Force strongly believe that ongoing communication among ESL educators is essential in order to respond effectively to the needs of ESL learners in higher education. The group endorses the work of intersegmental efforts such as the IMPAC project, which has allowed ESL professionals across the three segments to meet and collaborate. Many of the issues covered in this report were discussed at meetings of the IMPAC project over the last three years. The Task Force hopes that vehicles for continued communication and a sharing of resources can be established, and it voices a need for meetings of ESL professionals within each segment.

With all of these ideas in mind, the Task Force concludes with a summary of the recommendations of this report and adds two final recommendations.

Identification, Assessment, and Placement

1. Our public higher education systems should work with legislators toward the goal of developing a statewide system for identifying ESL learners and tracking their progress through the educational segments.

2. Campuses should review current assessment and placement instruments, and, where needed, develop more accurate instruments and appropriate placement procedures for ESL students.

ESL Courses and Programs

1. Campuses should provide ESL instruction and related support services to entering and transfer students, including generation 1.5 students.

2. Campuses should review the adequacy of current ESL instruction. Issues examined might include the following: skill areas and number of levels, appropriate class size, the number of course sections, degree applicability of courses, course repeatability, and program evaluation.

3. Campuses should encourage ESL learners to address their academic language needs in an appropriate and timely manner.

Student Support Services

1. Campuses should coordinate and improve support services specifically designed to meet ESL learners' needs, keeping in mind the different populations (international students, immigrants both long-term and recently arrived, generation 1.5).

2. ESL professionals should be called on as resources in all areas of student support for working with ESL students.

3. Campuses should improve the identification of ESL students with learning disabilities and develop ways to meet their special needs.

Additional Recommendations

1. Through intersegmental collaboration, a higher education website should be developed for ESL professionals from all three segments of public higher education in California. This could include such features as a directory of California public college and university ESL professionals, a searchable annotated bibliography of studies, program profiles, and reports that specifically focus on current ESL practices and issues in higher education, and links to these reports.

2. Each system should institute a formal organization of ESL Coordinators to develop ways to serve ESL students more effectively.

References

Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (Fall 2004). *Issues in Basic Skills Assessment and Placement in the California Community Colleges*.

California Community College System Office, Management Information Systems Datamart. Accessed January 9, 2006, from http://www.ccco.edu.

California Community College System Office, Research and Planning Unit (2003). *Peer Group Membership for Density and Enrollment Size*. Personal communication.

California Department of Education (2005). *California Department of Education Fact Book 2005: Handbook of Education Information*. Accessed June 23, 2006 from http://www.cde. ca.gov/re/pn/fb/yr05english.asp.

California State University (1997). *Executive Order 665*. Available at http://www.calstate.edu/ EO/EO-665.pdf.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (2001). *California Pathways: The Second Language Student in Public High Schools, Colleges, and Universities* (first published 1996, revised 2001).

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (2002). *Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities*.

Kelley, D. (2005). "Fewer Leave State When They Move*." Los Angeles Times*. September 6, 2005.

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges (2003). *The Neglected "R": The Need for a Writing Revolution*. Princeton, NJ: College Entrance Examination Board.

Rumbaut, R.G. & Ima, K. (1988)*. The Adaptation of Southeast Asian Refugee Youth: A Comparative Study*. (Final report to the Office of Resettlement). San Diego, CA: San Diego State University (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 299 372.).

University of California (1989). *English as a Second Language at the University of California: A Report to UCUPRE* from the ESL Subcommittee..

University of California (2002). *A Perspective on Developing a New Master Plan*. Available at http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/UCMasterPlanPerspective.pdf.

Glossary

Academic literacy: The skills and background knowledge necessary to read and write for educational purposes, including texts and examinations.

Academic programs: Programs that have academic goals, usually degree programs.

Associate credit: Credit for Associate of Arts/Associate of Science (AA/AS) degrees at the community college level (See also *Degree-applicable credit*).

Across the disciplines: Course work inclusive of several different academic subjects (e.g., history, science, mathematics, languages, engineering).

Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE): Diagnostic writing examination taken by entering UC freshmen (known previously as the Subject A Exam).

Baccalaureate credit: Credit toward a bachelor's degree at a four-year college/university.

Basic skills: Academic abilities to read, write, and compute; basic skills courses at CCC do not carry credit for graduation.

California Bilingual Educators (CABE): Professional organization; affiliate of the national organization NABE.

California Department of Education (CDE): State agency overseeing K-12 education

California English Language Development Test (CELDT): Test for K-12 English language learners.

Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA): 45-minute cloze test used to place students in appropriate course work.

California Master Plan: Legislative blueprint that lays out the educational goals and policies for postsecondary public education in California.

California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC): The planning and coordinating body for higher education under the California Master Plan.

California Teachers of English for Speakers of Other Languages (CATESOL): Professional organization; affiliate of the international organization TESOL.

Credit bearing: Courses that, upon successful completion, grant credit toward academic degrees.

Course correlation: Manner by which the course outcomes measure in comparison to other assessments.

Degree-applicable credit: Course credit for academic degrees at CCC, CSU and UC institutions.

Developmental course: Course for students learning/developing new material and skills, e.g., English as a second language (not remedial, which refers to information already learned but insufficiently mastered as preparation for subsequent course work).

Dominant language: Language spoken most often by the student.

English as second language (ESL): The study of English by speakers of other languages as a second or subsequent language, generally in an English-speaking country.

English competencies: Ability to speak, listen, read, and write in English.

English Council of California Two-Year Colleges (ECCTYC): Professional organization.

English Placement Test (EPT): The CSU placement examination (includes reading, grammatical and mechanical components, and a writing sample), developed and published by ETS (Educational Testing Services).

ESL student/English language learner: Most narrowly, students enrolled in English as second language courses; occasionally also a broad label for students who are not fluent English speakers.

Equal opportunity program (EOP): Programs that offer access to education for students with particular needs, such as low-income or receiving other government assistance; also known as Equal Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS).

Generation 1.5: Students who arrive in the United States at an early age (e.g., 5, 6, 7) speaking a language other than English, or who are born in the United States into non-English-speaking families, and who must learn English as a second language when they enter school; at the postsecondary level, students often have high oral skills but retain features of another language in their writing.

Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR): The junior-level undergraduate/graduate student requirement for a writing class or writing examination taken by students who desire a degree from the CSU; has different labels on different campuses, e.g., Junior English Proficiency Test (JPET), Writing Proficiency Exam (WPE), and Writing Proficiency Assessment (WPA).

Home language: Language spoken in the home environment (not necessarily a student's dominant language).

Immigrant student: Student who arrives in the United States planning to remain; usually on resident green card, often with plans for citizenship status.

Intensive English program (IEP): Programs directed at international students, to study English in an American setting with considerable classroom experience, compounded with outside opportunities to expand their English proficiency; often focuses on TOEFL preparation.

International student: Student who arrives in the United States for purposes of limited study and then returns to home country; on student visa status.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS): Includes representatives of each of the three public postsecondary education systems—California Community Colleges, California State Universities, University of California.

Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC): An intersegmental group that spans K-12 through university, working under the auspices of the California Education Round Table (CERT).

Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC): Agreement that allows for completion of lower-division general education curriculum prior to transfer to a CSU or UC.

Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulated Curriculum (IMPAC): Faculty project for coordination of CCC courses with majors in the CSU and UC to ensure that students do not lose units while transferring from CCC to UC or CSU.

Language minority student: Student whose native language is another language and is learning English.

Limited English proficiency (LEP): Term used in K-12 to indicate students who are learning English.

Mainstreaming: Act of placing students in traditional (English-speaking) classrooms with no additional attention to students' linguistic or cultural needs.

Matriculation policies: Guidelines which govern the process by which students move from one educational level to another (e.g., community college to UC or CSU).

Multi-skill courses: Courses which focus on a variety of skills, e.g., reading, writing, speaking and listening.

Native language: The language a person speaks as s/he begins to use language.

Native speaker: A speaker of the language s/he began to use as a first language.

Non-native speaker: A speaker of a language other than that which was learned as a first language.

Noncredit/non-credit bearing: In CSU and UC, courses which do not grant credit for degree (non-degree applicable); may often apply units for financial aid, sports participation, housing, etc.; In CCC, noncredit is for a completely separate category of courses—nine authorized areas; often similar to the work of adult school programs offered through K12.

Non-degree applicable: Courses that do not bear credit toward academic degrees conferred by the CCC, CSU and UC systems. In the CCC, the term is used to differentiate between degree-applicable credit and non-degree-applicable credit and not used for noncredit courses.

Objective test: Assessment which can be machine scored; generally consists of an answer from a defined set of choices.

Oral proficiency: Degree of speaking and listening abilities.

Portfolio assessment: Materials collected over time and across course work, along with reflections, for assessment of educational attainment.

Precollegiate/pre-baccalaureate courses: Courses offered at the level(s) below that which allows credit toward degree.

Reliability: The quality of a measurement that allows for repeatability or consistency.

Second language acquisition: The developmental process of acquiring another language (in this context, English).

Self selection/Student self-selection: A student's opportunity to choose his/her own academic pathway, usually referring to option of choosing native-speaker or non-native/ multilingual speaker track in English course work.

Subjective tests: Assessment instruments which rely on human judgment (e.g., reading and scoring of essays).

Subject A: The UC writing placement examination (known today as the AWPE, Analytical Writing Placement Examination) taken by freshmen.

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL): An ETS (Educational Testing Services) examination taken by international students who desire admission to North American postsecondary education institutions.

Three college/university systems: The systems of California Community Colleges, California State University, and University of California.

Transferable/Transfer-level courses: Course work which is applicable toward and recognized for degree programs at other postsecondary education institutions.

University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE): A UC committee that monitors and conducts evaluation on preparatory and remedial education.

Validation: The quality of measurement that confirms testing is true to its expressed focus.

Vocational programs: Technical or medical training programs.

Writing sample: A student-produced essay or paragraph used for placement or assessment.

Appendix A-1: Survey Instrument

Respondent Information

1i.   Please provide the following information about yourself and your campus. Your name and other identifying information will be kept confidential.

Name: _____

Email address: _____

Telephone: _____

1ii.   What is your job position?

1iii.   How long have you been at this position?(Please state years/months):

1iv.   What is your degree/professional preparation? (e.g., B.A. English + TESL Certificate, M.A.English, Ph.D. Applied Linguistics)

1v.   What is the name of your campus?

1vi.   Which system does your campus belong to?

□   CC

□   CSU

□   UC

Section I. Identification of ESL Learners: Community College Campuses

[UC and CSU: skip to Section 2]

1.   On your campus, are entering students identified as second language learners of English?

□   Yes

□   No

1a.   On your campus, how are entering students identified as second language learners of English? (check all that apply)

□   They are self-identified...

□   ...on their applications

□   ...by the placement test they choose to take

□   ...by another means, (please explain):

☐ They are identified by someone else...

    ☐ ...during placement testing

    ☐ ...through biographical data

    ☐ ...through visa data

    ☐ ...through a combination of placement testing and biographical data

    ☐ ...by another means, (please explain):

2. In its reports concerning such subjects as accreditation, demographics, and student success rates, does your campus gather general statistics about the number of ESL learners who are not international students?

☐ Yes

☐ No

3. If you answered Yes to question 2, what office can provide copies of such reports to the ESL Task Force?

4. Do you have any further comments on the identification of ESL learners on your campus and on your administration's awareness of their numbers?

Section 2. Identification of ESL Learners: CSU and UC Campuses

[Community College: skip to Section 3]

5. On your campus, are entering freshmen identified as second language learners of English?

☐ Yes

☐ No

5a. On your campus, how are entering freshmen identified as second language learners of English? (check all that apply)

☐ They are self-identified...

    ☐ ...on their applications

    ☐ ...by the placement test they choose to take

    ☐ ...by another means, (please explain):

☐ They are identified by someone else...

    ☐ ...during placement testing

    ☐ ...through visa data

    ☐ ...through biographical data

    ☐   ...through a combination of placement testing and biographical data

    ☐   ...by another means, (please explain):

6.   On your campus, are entering transfer students identified as second language learners of English?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6a.   On your campus, how are entering transfer students identified as second language learners of English? (check all that apply)

☐ They are self-identified...

    ☐   ...on their applications

    ☐   ...by the placement test they choose to take

    ☐   ...by another means, (please explain):

☐ They are identified by someone else...

    ☐   ...during placement testing

    ☐   ...through visa data

    ☐   ...through biographical data

    ☐   ...through a combination of placement testing and biographical data

    ☐   ...by another means, (please explain):

7.   In its reports concerning such subjects as accreditation, demographics, and student success rates, does your campus gather general statistics about the number of ESL learners who are not international students?

☐ Yes

☐ No [Skip to question 11]

8.   If you answered Yest to Question 2, what office could provide copies of such reports to the ESL Task Force?

9.   Which of the following groups are included in the information given in your campus's reports about ESL learners? (check all that apply)

☐ Incoming freshmen

☐ Incoming transfer students

10. If both of these groups are included, are they differentiated in campus reports?

    ☐ Yes

    ☐ No

11. Further comments on the identification of ESL learners on your campus, and on your administration's awareness of their numbers:

Section 3. Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners: Community College Campuses [CSU: skip to Section 4]

[UC: skip to Section 5]

12. What assessment instruments does your institution use for placement of freshmen ESL learners? (Check all that apply)

    ☐ A single English placement test for all students in which ESL learners are placed based on cut scores only

    ☐ A single English placement test for all students in which students are placed based on reader evaluation only

    ☐ A single English placement test for all students where ESL students are placed based on both cut scores and reader evaluation

    ☐ A specific placement test for ESL learners

    ☐ Other (Please describe)

12a. Who or what determines which test (ESL/English) the students take?

    ☐ Students themselves

    ☐ Counselors

    ☐ ESL specialists

13. How were the assessment instruments checked in Question 12 produced? (Check all that apply)

    ☐ They were written by faculty on campus

    ☐ They were commercially developed

    ☐ They were developed system-wide

13a. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

14. If your placement test was written on campus, has it received approval from the Chancellor's Office?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ N/A

15. Who on your campus determines cut-off scores for placement?

☐ ESL specialists

☐ Non-ESL specialists

☐ The research or testing office

☐ A combination of A through C

☐ A systemwide committee

☐ Other (please state who):

16. Is there a process for an ESL student to challenge a placement determination? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Yes, retest using the same test

☐ Yes, retest using a different test

☐ Yes, student may appeal results by oral or written request

☐ Yes, (if different from above, please explain)

☐ No process

17. If entering freshmen ESL students are placed into courses for second language learners of English, is their progress tracked by any department, program or other campus entity?

☐ Progress is not tracked

☐ Progress in completing ESL courses is tracked

☐ Progress is completing other writing requirements is tracked

17a. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

Section 4. Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners: CSU Campuses

[CC: skip to Section 6] [UC: skip to Section 5]

As you answer the questions below, please note that some questions relate to the assessment and placement of three different groups:

- ☐ ESL immigrant students
- ☐ international students
- ☐ transfer students.

All freshmen entering the CSU must take the English Placement Test (EPT), which is composed of an essay and two machine-scored sections. The exam is used to determine whether or not a student is ready for freshman composition.

18. How are the results of the EPT used to place ESL immigrant students into appropriate classes?

- ☐ Students are placed in classes by cut scores only.
- ☐ Students are placed in classes by cut scores and separate reader evaluation.
- ☐ Students self-identify as ESL and are placed in classes by cut scores.
- ☐ Other:

19. Who determines the cut scores for the EPT for your ESL immigrant students? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ ESL specialists
- ☐ Non-ESL specialists
- ☐ campus research or testing office
- ☐ Chancellor's research or testing office
- ☐ Other:

20. Is there a process for an ESL immigrant student to challenge an EPT placement determination?

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, retest using a different test
- ☐ Yes, student may appeal results by oral or written request
- ☐ Yes, (if different from above, please explain)

21. Does your campus supplement the EPT test with a separate test to identify and place ESL immigrant learners?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No [Skip to question 26]

22. If you answered "yes" to Question 21, who determines who should take the separate ESL test?

   ☐ students themselves

   ☐ counselors

   ☐ ESL specialists

   ☐ Other (please describe)

23. How was this supplemental ESL test produced?

   ☐ It was written by faculty on campus

   ☐ It was commercially developed

   ☐ Other (please explain)

24. Who on your campus determines placement scores for this supplemental ESL test?

   ☐ ESL administrator(s)

   ☐ A committee of ESL teachers

   ☐ A combination of A and B

   ☐ Other (please explain):

25. Does your institution track the progress of ESL immigrant students across courses at your institution?

   ☐ No

   ☐ Yes (Please explain what kind of tracking is done and by whom.)

26. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

All international students entering the CSU must take the TOEFL examination or some equivalent examination. This exam along with other factors is used to determine whether or not these students can enter the university. The following questions relate specifically to international students who speak English as a second or other language.

27. How are the results of the EPT used to place entering international students into appropriate classes?

□ International students do not take the EPT

□ International students are placed in classes by EPT cut scores only.

□ International students are placed in classes by EPT cut scores and separate reader evaluation.

□ International students are required to take a supplemental ESL test for placement.

□ Other:

28. Is there a process for an international student to challenge a placement determination? (Check all that apply.)

□ No

□ Yes, student may appeal results by oral or written request

□ Yes, (if different from above, please explain)

29. Does your institution track the progress of international students across courses at your institution?

□ No

□ Yes (Please explain)

30. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

The following questions relate specifically to transfer students who enter the CSU after their freshman year.

31. Does your campus use a test to identify and place ESL transfer students?

□ Yes

□ No

32. Is the test identified in Question 31 the same test as the one used to identify and place ESL immigrant or international students on your campus?

□ Yes

□ No

33. Who determines which transfer students should take the ESL test?

□ Students themselves

□ Counselors

☐ ESL specialists

☐ Other (please describe)

34. How was this ESL test produced?

☐ It was written by faculty on campus

☐ It was commercially developed

☐ Other (please explain)

35. Who on your campus determines placement scores for this ESL test?

☐ ESL administrator(s)

☐ A committee of ESL teachers

☐ A combination of ESL administrator(s) and a committee of ESL teachers

☐ Other (please explain):

36. Does your institution track the progress of ESL transfer students across courses at your institution?

☐ No

☐ Yes (Please explain what kind of tracking is done and by whom.)

37. What concerns do you have about the procedures used to place transfer students into courses for ESL learners?

38. Approximately how many students per year are placed into ESL-designated courses? Please include all types of ESL students (immigrant, transfer, international, etc.) in your estimate:

39. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

Section 5. Assessment and Placement of ESL Learners: UC Campuses

[CC and CSU: skip to Section 6]

Assessment and placement of incoming freshmen:
The University of California administers the statewide Subject A Examination (now called the Analytical Writing Placement Examination, or AWPE) to all entering freshmen. Upon evaluation of this examination, stude   nts with non-passing scores and whose writing exhibits characteristics of ESL learners are marked with an "E."

40. When your campus receives the "E" papers from the systemwide Subject A/AWPE read, how do you use them for placement of freshmen in writing courses? (Check all that apply.)

☐ We do not re-read the E papers; all students take a Subject A equivalent course

☐ regardless of the E designation.

☐ We do not re-read the E papers; but most students with an E designation are placed into an ESL course or a course specifically designed to develop ESL students' English writing proficiency.

☐ We re-read the E papers using our own evaluation criteria in order to place students in our ESL writing courses or other courses specifically designed to develop ESL students' English writing proficiency.

☐ We re-test all students with an E designation using our own campus exam and we use this campus exam to place students in an appropriate writing course for ESL students.

☐ We use a combination of re-reading the E papers and our own assessment

☐ instrument(s) to place students in an appropriate writing course for ESL students.

☐ We do not use the E designation to place students in courses, but we do use it in some cases to advise students to take writing courses specifically designed for ESL/ multilingual students.

☐ Other (please describe) _____

40a.   Please use the space below to make additional comments:

41.   If you have your own campus assessment instrument(s), how are they produced? (Check all that apply. If NONE apply, skip to question 43)

☐ They are written by ESL faculty on campus.

☐ They are commercially developed

☐ Other (please describe)

42.   If you have your own campus assessment instrument(s), what types of tasks are included? (Check all that apply):

☐ Composition writing

☐ Multiple choice questions

☐ Reading tasks

☐ Discrete grammar questions

☐ Discrete vocabulary questions

☐ Listening to a lecture

☐ A cloze exercise where students fill in the blanks with appropriate words

☐ Speaking tasks

☐ Other (please describe)

43. On your campus, who determines placement of students who have received an E designation at the systemwide Subject A examination? (Check all that apply)

☐ ESL specialists

☐ Non-ESL specialists

☐ A research or testing office

☐ Other (please explain who)

44. On your campus, is it possible for a student who has received an E designation to be placed directly into a mainstream or ESL-designated Subject A composition course (i.e., to be given a campus placement that bypasses pre-Subject A ESL courses).

☐ Yes

☐ No

45. On your campus, is there a process through which a student can challenge an ESL placement determination? (check all that apply)

☐ Yes, the student can be retested using the same assessment instruments as described above.

☐ Yes, the student can be retested using a different test or procedure.

☐ Yes, the student can appeal based on a first-week-of-class diagnostic essay.

☐ Yes, a student may appeal results with an oral or written request.

☐ Yes, (if different from any of the above, please explain)

☐ No, a student may not appeal a placement decision.

46. If entering freshmen ESL students are placed into courses that are specifically designed to improve their English writing proficiency, is their progress tracked by any department, program, or other campus entity?

☐ Progress is not tracked.

☐ Progress in completing ESL courses is tracked.

☐ Progress in completing other writing requirements is tracked.

46a. Please describe briefly who does this tracking (e.g., the ESL Program, composition program or other campus unit) and what tracking is done (e.g., success rates of students in passing

ESL courses, amount of time from ESL placement to completion of Subject A requirement, success of students in mainstream composition courses after completing ESL courses).

47. On your campus, approximately how many freshmen per academic year are placed in ESL designated courses?

48. Please use the space below to make additional comments:

Assessment and placement of incoming transfer students
[continuation of Section 5 for UC only]

49. Does your campus assess incoming ESL transfer students?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 54]

50. On your campus, who determines whether transfer students are placed in ESL courses (check all that apply)?

☐ ESL specialists

☐ Non-ESL specialists

☐ A research or testing office

☐ Other (please explain who)

51. On your campus, is there a process through which a transfer student can challenge an ESL placement determination? (check all that apply)

☐ Yes, the student can be retested using the same assessment instruments as described in Question 9.

☐ Yes, the student can be retested using a different test or procedure.

☐ Yes, the student can appeal based on a first-week-of-class diagnostic essay.

☐ Yes, a student may appeal results with an oral or written request.

☐ Yes, (if different from any of the above, please explain)

☐ No, a student may not appeal a placement decision.

52. If transfer ESL students are placed into courses specifically designed to improve their academic English, is their progress tracked by any department, program, or other campus entity?

☐ Progress is not tracked.

☐ Progress in completing ESL courses is tracked.

☐ Progress in completing other writing requirements is tracked.

52a. Please describe briefly who does this tracking (e.g., the ESL Program, composition program or other campus unit) and what tracking is done (e.g., success rates of students in passing ESL courses, amount of time from ESL placement to completion of writing requirements, success of students in mainstream writing courses after completing courses specifically designed for ESL writers).

53. On your campus, approximately how many ESL transfer students per academic year are placed in courses specifically designed to improve writing proficiency of ESL students?

54. Additional comments on assessment, placement or tracking of ESL transfer students:

Section 6: Courses and Programs for Academic and Vocational Preparation of ESL Learners: CC, CSU and UC Campuses

55intro. Does your campus have classes specifically designed for ESL learners?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 66]

55. What undergraduate classes specifically designed for ESL learners are offered at your institution?
Please check or circle the appropriate responses.

Type of Class Campus has? (check) Number of Levels (circle)

☐ Writing   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Reading   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Reading/Writing   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Pronunciation   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Listening   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Speaking   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Listening/Speaking 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Multi-Skill   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

☐ Grammar   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

55a. If your campus has another type of class specifically designed for ESL learners (not listed above), please specify the type and number of levels below:

Q 56: CSU/UC respondents only:

56. What student populations are these courses intended to serve?

- ☐ All courses serve freshmen only

- ☐ All courses serve upper-division only

- ☐ All courses serve both freshmen and upper division

- ☐ Some courses serve freshmen, while some serve upper division

- ☐ Most courses serve freshmen, while some/a few serve upper division

Q 57: CSU/UC respondents only:

57.   Are ESL courses at your institution credit-bearing?

- ☐ Yes, all are credit bearing.

- ☐ Some are credit bearing. Please indicate which.

- ☐ No, none are credit bearing

58.   In which department(s)/program(s) are courses for ESL learners of English offered? Check all that apply

- ☐ English

- ☐ ESL

- ☐ Linguistics

- ☐ Writing Program

- ☐ Developmental Studies

- ☐ Learning Skills Center

- ☐ Other (Please specify):

59.   What is the class size of ESL writing courses at your institution? Give either a number or a range (e.g., 18-25) of numbers as appropriate.

60.   Once students place into an ESL program, are they required to follow a specific sequence of courses?

- ☐ Yes

- ☐ No

61.   What types of grades are given in your courses for ESL learners of English? (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Letter grades

- ☐ Credit/no credit

- ☐ Pass/no pass

- ☐ Other (please specify)

62. Does your department/program use any of the following procedures or devices to standardize grading for writing courses? (check all that apply)

☐ Uniform grading rubrics which all instructors follow

☐ Common exams

☐ Group-graded exams

☐ Committee-evaluated portfolios

☐ Norming sessions for grading student papers or exams

☐ Exchange of papers for evaluation with other instructors in the program

☐ Other (Please describe):

63. Does your campus offer ESL sections of courses to prepare students to pass a test that satisfies GWAR?

☐ No

☐ Yes (Please explain):

☐ Not from a CSU campus

64. Aside from the courses already offered, what other courses for ESL learners are needed at your institution in order to meet students' needs?

☐ The courses we currently offer meet students' needs.

☐ We need additional sections or classes of the courses we already offer to accommodate all of our students.

☐ We need additional courses. (please specify which)

65. How is your program evaluated?

☐ Outside evaluator

☐ Program self-evaluation

☐ Other (please specify)

66. If no ESL courses are offered at your institution, how are the language needs of ESL learners of English addressed?

☐ Tutoring

☐ Language/Computer/Writing Lab

☐ Workshops

☐ Special training for writing faculty

☐ Special training for faculty across the curriculum

    ☐   Learning Skills Center drop in services

    ☐   Their needs are not addressed

67.   Additional comments about courses and programs for ESL students:

Section 7: Matriculation Practices Related to ESL Learners: CC, CSU and UC Campuses

68.   If a course has an ESL course prerequisite, can a student challenge the prerequisite?

    ☐   Yes

    ☐   No

    ☐   N/A

68a.   If yes, who makes a determination on the challenge?

69.   Are students accepted for degree/certificate programs before placement into ESL or English courses?

    ☐   Yes

    ☐   No

69a.   If yes, what time lines are required for completion of ESL courses?

70.   Are students in your department permitted to repeat ESL courses?

    ☐   Yes (some or all)

    ☐   No

70a.   If yes, which ones and how many times?

Type of Class? Can be repeated? Number of times can be repeated

    ☐   Writing Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Reading Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Reading/Writing Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Pronunciation Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Listening Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Speaking Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Listening/Speaking Yes No 1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Multi-Skill Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

    ☐   Grammar Yes No   1 2 3 4 5

70b.   If another type of ESL class can be repeated please specify the type of class and number of times it can be repeated below:

71.   Additional comments about matriculation practices:

Section 8. Matriculation Practices Related to ESL Learners: CSU and UC Campuses [CC: skip to Section 9]

Please respond to these questions only if your campus has special English or ESL sections for non-native English speakers:

72.   If ESL learners are placed into special sections of English composition for non-native speakers their freshmen year or when they first arrive to the university, which of the following apply? (Check all that apply)

☐   They must remain in the course the entire school term

☐   They can appeal to the instructor for a different placement

☐   They can appeal to the coordinator for a different placement

☐   Other (describe briefly):

72a.   Please use the space below to make additional comments:

73.   If ESL learners do not pass a composition course, how many times are they allowed to retake it?

Freshmen composition course

☐   Not allowed to retake

☐   1

☐   2

☐   3

☐   More than 3

ESL composition courses prerequisite to freshmen composition

☐   Not allowed to retake

☐   1

☐   2

☐   3

☐   More than 3

73a.   Please use the space below to make additional comments:

73b.   If students fail an ESL class other than freshmen composition, are they required to retake it and pass it before they take freshmen composition?

☐   Yes

☐   No

74.   If ESL learners have retaken a freshmen composition course the maximum number of times and still do not pass, what are the consequences? (Check all that apply.)

☐   They can petition to continue in the composition course for one more quarter.

☐   They are allowed to take an alternate course.

☐   They are dismissed from the university.

☐   They are provided extra tutoring.

☐   They are provided extra counseling.

☐   Other (please describe):

74a.   Please use the space below to make additional comments:

75.   Additional comments about matriculation practices:

Section 9. Student Support Services for ESL Learners: CC, CSU and UC Campuses

For each of the following student support services, please respond to the questions relevant to your campus. Note in some cases there are separate questions for international ESL students and other (e.g., immigrant) ESL learners since some campuses offer support for international learners but not for other ESL learners and vice versa. If your campus does

offer services for ESL learners that includes international and other ESL learners without distinguishing these populations, please check both categories.

Orientation/Initial Advising

76a.   Are there orientation/initial advising services designed specifically for international ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐ Yes

    ☐ No

76b.   Are there orientation/initial advising services designed specifically for other ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐ Yes

    ☐ No [if you answered No to both 76a and 76b, skip to question 77a]

76c.   Please provide a brief description of orientation/initial advising specifically designed for ESL learners.

76d.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of the orientation/initial advising provided for ESL learners:

    ☐ Excellent

    ☐ Good

    ☐ Average

    ☐ Below Average

    ☐ Poor

    ☐ Unable to evaluate

76e.   Comments related to the rating:

Counseling

77a.   Are there counseling services designed specifically for international ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐ Yes

    ☐ No

77b.   Are there counseling services designed specifically for other ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐ Yes

    ☐ No [if you answered No to both 77a and 77b, skip to question 78a]

77c.   Please provide a brief description of counseling services specifically designed for ESL learners.

77d.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of counseling services provided for ESL learners

    ☐   Excellent

    ☐   Good

    ☐   Average

    ☐   Below Average

    ☐   Poor

    ☐   Unable to evaluate

77e.   Comments related to the rating:

Tutoring/Learning Centers

78a.   Are there tutoring/learning center services designed specifically for international ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐   Yes

    ☐   No

78b.   Are there tutoring/learning center services designed specifically for other ESL learners on your campus?

    ☐   Yes

    ☐   No [if you answered No to both 78a and 78b, skip to question 79a]

78c.   Please provide a brief description of tutoring/learning center services specifically designed for ESL learners.

78d.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of tutoring/learning center services provided for ESL learners:

    ☐   Excellent

    ☐   Good

    ☐   Average

    ☐   Below Average

    ☐   Poor

    ☐   Unable to evaluate

78e.   Comments related to the rating:

Transfer Services (Prospective transfers for CC's, incoming transfers for UC's)

79a.   Are there transfer services designed specifically for international ESL learners on your campus?

☐ Yes

☐ No

79b.   Are there transfer services designed specifically for other ESL learners on your campus?

☐ Yes

☐ No [if you answered No to both 79a and 79b, skip to question 80a]

79c.   Please provide a brief description of transfer services specifically designed for ESL learners.

79d.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of transfer services provided for ESL learners:

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Average

☐ Below Average

☐ Poor

☐ Unable to evaluate

79e.   Comments related to the rating:

Outreach to Feeder High Schools

80a.   Are there outreach services designed specifically to target ESL high school learners?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 81a]

80b.   Please provide a brief description of outreach services specifically designed for ESL learners.

80c.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of the outreach services provided for ESL learners:

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Average

☐ Below Average

☐ Poor

☐ Unable to evaluate

80d.   Comments related to the rating:

Services for At-Risk Students (EOPS/EOP)

81a.   Are there services for at-risk students designed specifically for ESL learners on your campus?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 82a]

81b.   Please provide a brief description of services for at-risk students specifically designed for ESL learners.

81c.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of services provided for at-risk ESL learners.

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Average

☐ Below Average

☐ Poor

☐ Unable to evaluate

81d.   Comments related to the rating:

Services for Disabled Students

82a.   Are there disabled student services designed specifically for ESL learners on your campus?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 83a]

82b.   Please provide a brief description of disabled student services specifically designed for ESL learners.

82c.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of disabled students services provided for ESL learners:

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Average

☐ Below Average

☐ Poor

☐ Unable to evaluate

82d.   Comments related to the rating:

Financial Aid Services

83a.   Are there financial aid services designed specifically for ESL learners on your campus?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No [skip to question 84a]

83b.   Please provide a brief description of financial aid services specifically designed for ESL learners.

83c.   Rate the overall effectiveness of financial aid services provided for ESL learners:

   ☐ Excellent

   ☐ Good

   ☐ Average

   ☐ Below Average

   ☐ Poor

   ☐ Unable to evaluate

83d.   Comments related to the rating:

Job Placement/Career Center

84a.   Are there job placement/career services designed specifically for ESL learners on your campus?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No [skip to question 85]

84c.   Please rate the overall effectiveness of job placement/career center services offered for ESL learners.

   ☐ Excellent

   ☐ Good

   ☐ Average

   ☐ Below Average

   ☐ Poor

   ☐ Unable to evaluate

84d.   Comments related to the rating:

Other services

85. Are there other services designed specifically for ESL learners on your campus that were not mentioned above?

☐ Yes

☐ No [skip to question 86]

85b. Please provide a brief description of other service(s) specifically designed for ESL learners.

85c. Please rate the overall effectiveness of the services provided.

☐ Excellent

☐ Good

☐ Average

☐ Below Average

☐ Poor

☐ Unable to evaluate

85d. Comments related to the rating:

86. Could a member of the ICAS ESL Task Force contact you about your responses if we have any questions or if we want to get further information about your campus? You will only be contacted if you say "yes."

☐ Yes, I would be willing to be contacted

☐ No, I would prefer not to be contacted further

87. Would you like to receive email notification when the report from this study is available?

☐ Yes

☐ No, thanks

Again, thank you very much for your time and expertise in completing this survey

Appendix A-2: Survey Respondent Information

Respondents for the survey provided information about the positions they held at their institutions, the number of years in their positions, and their professional degrees. Of the 88 respondents, 85 supplied this information. Seven of these respondents did not complete the entire survey. Roughly one-fifth of the respondents stated they were professors, and one-fifth were instructors or lecturers. Nearly a third of the respondents held joint appointments as faculty (e.g., professor/instructor) and administrators (e.g., director, coordinator, chair or vice chair). The other respondents (approximately 16%) held administrative positions that did not involve teaching. In all, over 82% of the respondents stated that teaching was at least a part of their position.

The length of time respondents had held positions at their postsecondary institutions varied from one to more than 20 years. Slightly more than one-third of the respondents had been in their positions five years or less. Twenty-two percent had held their position between six and ten years and 23% for 11-15 years. The remaining 21% had held their positions 16 or more years.

Regarding professional degrees, the majority (72%) had at least a Masters degree, with 38% possessing an MA in TESL and another 8% a TESL Certificate with an MA in another field.

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents held a PhD degree, with only a small percentage of those having an MA in TESL as well.

Appendix B: Campus Profiles

As discussed in the Introduction to this report, the following descriptions of individual campuses from each of the three California postsecondary education systems offer portraits of ESL programs and the students they serve to illustrate more holistically the diversity of our programs and learners. The campuses selected reflect differences in location and size. The profiles reveal a wide range of course offerings across skill areas, many different student populations, and significant differences in the ways that programs are staffed and administered. It is hoped that readers will get some sense of the many challenges faced by our campuses in assessing students and in designing and administering ESL programs and courses.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Yuba College

Yuba College in Marysville is the larger of the two-college Yuba Community College District. There are approximately 5,500 students enrolled at the Marysville campus, of which around 375 are in the ESL program. The program offers 25 to 30 mostly three-unit courses each semester, all of which have noncredit sections to accommodate recent immigrants and non-California residents. The more rigorous daytime program has three lower levels—beginning, low-intermediate and intermediate—with four skill-specific courses at each level: listening/pronunciation, grammar, reading, and writing. The fourth level has two grammar courses and two composition courses, three and four semesters below the freshman composition level. Level five has only two courses, advanced grammar and composition, two levels below the freshman composition level. Writing courses currently all have linked labs, and several courses have online components. An additional series of conversation courses has been offered at the first four levels, but these will likely be discontinued due to a shortage of resources. Only three courses count toward the AA degree and are transferable to four-year colleges. Yuba College's evening and summer program has one integrated skills course at each of levels one through four.

In addition to the above "general" ESL courses, Yuba offers six vocational ESL courses: English for Math, English for Early Childhood Education, English for Employment (levels two and three), the very popular English for Computer Job Search, and English for Office Work.

Roughly 67% of ESL students are Hispanic, 13% Hmong, 11% East Indian, and 9% are other Asian and European ethnicities. There are three full-time instructors, of which one holds a non-tenure-track position, and there are currently eight adjunct ESL faculty, down from eleven just two years ago.

Grossmont College

Grossmont College, the larger campus in the two-college Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District, serves the East San Diego County communities. Nearly 18,000 full- and part-time students attend the college per semester. Students can choose from 153 degree and certificate programs.

The mid-sized ESL program serves around 1,000 students, 40 to 50% of whom are international students and the rest residents/immigrants. The TOEFL requirement is 450, which means that most of the visa students still need more ESL support. The ESL students are very diverse, with at least 25 different languages represented. The largest ethnic groups among the residents are Hispanic and Middle-Eastern, with Russian and East African groups the next largest. Asians represent the majority of the international students, with Japanese the largest group. Brazilians are the largest non-Asian group. There is a small intensive English program on campus that prepares students for the TOEFL and entrance into the college. The program has grown a lot since its beginning in 1987, but there has not been much change in the population over the past year. Attendance at the college as a whole is down, and the international students are having more problems obtaining visas.

Over 50 sections of ESL are offered. There are four levels of the core courses, which are five-unit integrated grammar, reading, and writing classes. An additional introductory level is made up of two six-unit classes, one focusing on writing and grammar, the other on listening/speaking. Three levels of listening/speaking classes and reading and vocabulary development classes make up the three-unit supplemental classes. The highest level of ESL is offered in ESL sections of the college composition course one level below freshman composition. This is currently the last English course students receiving an associate's degree need to complete. ESL students continuing on in English for transfer take native speaker courses at the freshman composition level. All courses are offered for credit, though only the intermediate and higher level classes receive associate-degree credit. Core courses at the two highest levels and the college composition course are transferable as electives, though with an eight-unit limit. The adult level courses in this community are taught by the high school districts.

The ESL program is part of the English department, but the ESL coordinator receives one-third load reassigned time to hire and assess faculty and do all the other administrative

duties. She is one of the four full-time instructors. In addition, there are usually 25 adjunct instructors in the program. Because the international student tuition is considerable, there is a separate support system in place for these students. There are one full-time and two part-time counselors assigned to international students as well as an international student specialist who coordinates their advisements, home stays, special events, and other services. Two specialists in admissions and records deal with all the applications and record keeping.

American River College

American River College (ARC) is a large institution in the eastern area of Sacramento County with an unduplicated enrollment of around 32,000, the largest in the Los Rios Community College District. The college offers programs from trade apprenticeships through vocational programs and training in fire and police programs to four-year transfer tracks. Not quite a tenth of those enrollments, around 3,050, are in ESL.

These students are served by a program of mostly four-unit credit courses extending from novice level to advanced-high in the California Pathways system, with a total of eight separate levels. Courses at one level serve as prerequisites for those at the next level in the same skill strand. Skill strands are divided into courses with emphases on reading/vocabulary, writing, listening/speaking, and grammar. Listening/speaking strands are included through one level below the freshman composition course; grammar-emphasis courses are available from three levels through one level below the freshman composition level. There is also a freshman literature course; students passing both freshman-level courses receive credit at CSU for English 20 and have a first-time pass rate on the Graduate Writing Requirement of over 90%. The top four levels of courses have transfer status to CSU or UC. In addition to the standard courses, the department offers modularized instruction from one-half unit to two units in the college Learning Resource Center. There has been some talk about providing noncredit instruction at the new center in a fast-growing part of the service area, where no adult school services are available, but the department has been reluctant to make this departure from current Los Rios practice.

Over 70% of ARC ESL students come from the former Soviet Union, with Russian and Ukrainian as the two most heavily represented languages. There are as yet relatively few generation 1.5 students in these numbers; most students (64%) are immigrants over the age of 30.

The college employs 14 full-time and 21 adjunct professors in this program along with three instructional assistants and a tutoring staff that varies from five to twelve.

North Orange School of Continuing Education

The School of Continuing Education (SCE) is the noncredit segment of the North Orange County Community College district. Of the district's 65,000 students, 11,000 are served through the ESL program. The ESL program operates out of three campuses located in Anaheim, Cypress and Fullerton, the latter two situated across the street from Cypress and Fullerton Colleges, the sister colleges in the district that offer credit courses and programs. The ESL program also works with the Magnolia, Anaheim, Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified, and Buena Park School Districts to offer Community-Based English Tutoring (CBET) courses at elementary schools in the four districts. Including other sites, the ESL program offers noncredit courses at over 70 off-campus sites.

The CBET program is the largest noncredit program off campus. On campus, the ESL program is divided into a core curriculum of integrated skills courses taught at six levels and specialty courses such as computer skills for ESL learners, vocational ESL (VESL), and citizenship.

One of the strengths of the SCE ESL program is the articulation of its noncredit courses with credit courses. Three years ago, an articulation committee of noncredit and credit faculty met to evaluate their courses to see where the curriculum overlapped. They analyzed textbooks, examined the skills taught in each course, and conducted a blind analysis of student written work. They came to the conclusion that the point of matriculation was the noncredit intermediate-low level.

Students who complete the intermediate-low level in noncredit are now recruited for the credit ESL program. These students take the credit program placement test and take the first trimester credit course as a noncredit student but are subjected to the same rigor as a credit student. If the student passes, he/she can get credit for the course and continue in the program.

The VESL program also has strong links to credit vocational programs in pharmacy technician, electrician/general construction, and early childhood education. Students in the credit programs who are having ESL language problems in these programs are referred to noncredit VESL courses specially tailored to these vocational areas.

The average age of an SCE student is in the late 20s to early 30s. The primary focuses of these students are survival English, English to help them find a job, or improving their English for job advancement. Most students finished high school in their native countries. Three quarters of the ESL learners at the SCE come from Spanish-speaking households. The second largest group is Korean, comprising 18% of the student population. Other groups include Middle Eastern and Chinese.

Of the 130 faculty teaching in the ESL program, only three are full-time. The students are served by four full-time Matriculation Counselors, which are shared with other articulated noncredit programs. There are also five part-time counselors dedicated to ESL students.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

California State Polytechnic University at Pomona

California State Polytechnic University at Pomona (known as Cal Poly Pomona) is a moderate-sized state university in southern California with a student population of approximately 20,000. Its premier engineering, computer, architecture, urban and regional planning programs as well as other programs attract students from California but also other parts of the United States and abroad. As a result, Cal Poly Pomona has many non-native speakers of English, including generation 1.5 students, who profit by enrollment in the composition and literature courses offered to multilingual speakers. Although the precise number of matriculated international students (655, Fall Quarter 2005) is precisely known, the exact number of non-native speakers of English entering the university as freshmen from American high schools or upper-division transfers from community colleges or other universities is not known since there is no reliable method for collecting this information at the present time.

The English and Foreign Languages department, in its regular writing program, offers courses which native English speakers may take to fulfill the Freshman writing requirement. It also offers a parallel track of courses in its English for Multilingual Speakers program (EMS) which address the specific language needs of second language students who represent considerable diversity in linguistic, cultural and experiential backgrounds. Students in these classes may include recent immigrant, visa, and especially generation 1.5 students.

The EMS program at Cal Poly Pomona offers one literature course, Modern Fiction for Multilingual Speakers of English, and four composition courses: two developmental courses (pre-baccalaureate level), and two freshman composition courses, which together satisfy the general education freshman composition requirement, each with four quarter units of baccalaureate credit. These four classes are academic courses (not to be confused with introductory ESL survival skills) which emphasize the necessary literacy demands of reading and writing for successful university course work. (There is a parallel track of courses which native English speakers may take to fulfill the Freshman writing requirement.)

Faculty who teach the EMS courses include senior tenured and tenure-track professionals who possess doctorates and master's degrees in teaching ESL and in Applied Linguistics, in addition to considerable training in ESL composition. Part-time lecturers and teaching

associates from the master's program in TESL also teach and conduct research in these courses. Approximately 300-500 undergraduates comprise the EMS course cohort each quarter, with Asian languages (i.e., dialects of Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Korean, and Japanese) as the most common linguistic background of most students, and Spanish as the second most common.

For all EMS course work, students are encouraged to use the university writing center workshops and tutoring sessions. In addition, faculty throughout the EMS program offer additional tutoring opportunities through the Grammar Co-op, by which students may attend office hours of any faculty member to request additional instruction. Faculty have developed and distributed boxes of materials on a broad variety of grammatical points to augment classroom instruction on an individual level and made themselves available to support learning of English skills on campus.

California State University Fresno

Located in Central California in Fresno, CSU Fresno is also known as Fresno State. Its ESL program, housed in the Linguistics department, is composed of four overlapping systems. Each system targets a slightly different student, involves different campus departments or offices and has its own policies and procedures. The oldest of the systems serves international students. The administrative duties related to this system are carried out jointly with the International Student Office. The preparatory ESL courses consist of two, three-unit reading and writing courses that international students take before freshman composition. In addition the department offers an upper-division writing class for international graduate students.

The second system, which involves cooperation with the English department on freshman composition issues, gives international students and a few immigrant students an opportunity to enroll in ESL sections of freshman composition along with a required one-unit workshop, which meets the university remediation requirement. The international students are placed into this class, or a preparatory ESL class, based on their University English Exam scores.

Some of the least proficient immigrant ESL students initially enroll in mainstream freshman composition classes taught by the English department. During the first few weeks, English faculty and Writing Center tutors identify a few students who have significant ESL problems in their compositions. These students are usually advised to drop freshman composition, enroll instead in preparatory ESL courses and then take the ESL section of freshman composition.

The third system, which involves cooperation with the Learning Resources Center, targets students with EPT scores in the lowest quartile. These students, native and non-native speakers of English, are invited to take a three-unit course focusing on building students' academic listening and note taking, as well as vocabulary and reading comprehension. Unlike the other ESL classes, this class does not focus on essay writing; it is taught by an ESL instructor using ESL methods. Enrollment in this course is growing.

The fourth system includes a three-unit upper-division writing course, which is one way students can meet the CSUF upper-division writing requirement, and three one-unit courses on revising and editing (RES). Upper division students self-select the upper division ESL writing and the RES classes.

The CSUF ESL classes, which offer academic credit, are intended for freshmen, upper-division or graduate students and are taught by full or part-time faculty; graduate teaching assistants enrolled in the MA program in Linguistics may teach the one-unit workshops. During the Fall 2005 semester, 130 students enrolled in three-unit ESL classes and about 65 enrolled in one-unit ESL classes.

In addition to the ESL program for matriculated students, CSUF has the American English Institute, a self-supporting program for international students with TOEFL scores too low for university admission.

While the ESL courses primarily serve the students enrolled in them, they also offer valuable settings for class observation by linguistics undergraduate and graduate students who are working on concentrations in TESL (Teaching of English as a Second Language) for their degrees

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

University of California at Davis

Still known as a "small-town university," UC Davis serves a student population of 30,000, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional students, the majority of whom are from California. Most students live on campus or in the city of Davis and make up close to half of the city's population of 64,000 residents.

The ESL program, located in the Linguistics department, serves approximately 400 undergraduate and 250 graduate and professional students each year. Undergraduate ESL students are predominantly immigrants who have attended U.S. middle and high schools. The great majority are from Asian first-language backgrounds.

ESL courses for undergraduates serve only freshmen who are identified as being non-native writers of English based on the UC system wide Analytical Writing Placement Exam, taken by all entering UC freshmen. Based on a re-reading of this exam, students identified as non-native writers of English are placed in the level appropriate to their skills in a three-course sequence of ESL courses focusing on reading and writing. While students in these courses are fulfilling a pre-freshman composition writing requirement, ESL courses are still fully credit bearing. Both a writing and a speaking skills course for transfer students exist, but lack of funding has prevented them from being offered on a regular basis. The undergraduate ESL program also runs its own small-scale tutoring program.

After completing ESL writing, freshmen must still fulfill the University Entry Level Writing Requirement (formerly Subject A) via examination. If they do not pass this exam, they take a pre-freshman writing course, which UC Davis has contracted with a local community college to teach. ESL writers may opt to enroll in a section of this course specially designed for non-native English speakers. Strict timelines exist under which freshmen must complete any required ESL courses as well as the Entry Level Writing Requirement, and should a student not meet the timetable, he or she is disenrolled from the university. Beyond ESL writing and pre-freshman composition, writing courses specially designed for ESL writers do not exist.

Graduate and Education Abroad international students are served in a separate sequence of courses consisting of a multi-skills course for new international students, a writing course for graduate students, and a speaking course for international teaching assistants. Graduate and Education Abroad ESL students at Davis are predominantly from Asia, with a smaller number from Central and South America, Europe, the Middle East, and Africa. For non-matriculated international students, UC Davis also has a large intensive English program, which is run by University Extension.

Instructors for both undergraduate and graduate ESL courses consist of full- and part-time lecturers and graduate students in Linguistics. A full professor in Linguistics is Program Director. The demand for ESL courses for matriculated students, both graduate and undergraduate, has increased over the years with all courses running consistently full. ESL courses also serve as an important training ground and source of research for master's degree and Ph.D. students in linguistics, many of whom are focusing their studies on second language acquisition, teaching, and research.