

**Committee on Preparatory Education
Proposal for Increased Curricular Support for Students Under-Prepared for
University-Level Writing**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

OVERVIEW

In recent years UC Santa Cruz, like the University of California systemwide, has seen a steady increase in the percent of newly admitted freshpersons who have not satisfied the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). The reasons for this upward trend in ELWR enrollments have not been fully charted, but the fact remains that increasing numbers of students arrive on campus challenged by university-level English.

Many of these students are English language learners (ELL), as documented by their writing and scores on the systemwide UC Analytical Writing Placement Exam (UCAWPE), taken in May of their senior year in high school by most newly-admitted UC students. Non-passing exams that exhibit significant features characteristic of the writing of non-native speakers of English or English language learners (ELL) are flagged for campuses to review for appropriate placement within their ESL or writing curricula. Non-passing exams with this ELL designation coming to UCSC have increased from 11% of the ELWR-liable students in 2001 to 20% in 2004 and 19% in 2005.

In addition to ELL writers, ELWR students include monolingual native English speakers and bilingual “Generation 1.5” students who have received all or most of their schooling in the U.S. but who nonetheless struggle with the demands of written English. Many come from under-resourced high schools in California that have not adequately prepared them for university-level challenges in reading and writing.

Given documented shifts in the demographics of California, it is likely that this population will continue to swell and be significantly represented among UCSC’s new students each year. The markers of this trend include a systemwide increase in not-passing exams during the annual May administration of the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, and the following developments at UCSC:

- An increasing percentage of incoming freshpersons in ELWR sections of Core classes;
- An increasing percentage of ELWR-liable students identified as English language learners;

- An increasing number of students at risk of being barred from further enrollment at UCSC for not having been able to satisfy the Entry-Level Writing Requirement within the four quarters allowed them.

Statistics from fall 2005 also suggest that a drop in the pass rate for the November (campus) administration of the exam may be another marker of this trend. (The pass rate for one exam administration is not enough to indicate a trend; nevertheless, other UC campuses that admit undergraduates saw a similar significant drop in the November pass rate.)

All of these markers appear within the larger context of UC enrollment. Enrollments at almost all of the UC campuses fell below expectations in 2005-06; the resulting competition among UC campuses for this smaller pool of students continues today. Such competition will have predictable results for UCSC: a larger number of the students who wind up enrolling here will come from the lower reaches of the UC eligibility index (the top 12.5% of California high school graduates). These changes will further affect the percentage of ELWR-liable and ELL students enrolled here, if they have not already.

These students have satisfied UC admissions requirements and have been admitted to the UC system. They deserve the complete support of the campus in meeting their writing requirements and achieving success at the university.

Students at UCSC have four quarters after initial enrollment as freshmen to satisfy the ELWR. At the end of their fall college Core course, ELWR students' writing proficiency is assessed again. Over the past six years, the November ELWR pass rate has steadily averaged about 78%, but slipped to an unusually low 71% in November 2005. Furthermore, over the five-year period from 2001-2005, the number of fourth-quarter students at risk of being barred for failing to satisfy the ELWR increased from 14 in 2001 to 42 in 2005. Of those 42, at the end of fall 2005 nine were in fact barred. Of the others, many managed to meet the requirement only after four quarters of hard work with considerable writing support—support at a level that does not continue for these students thereafter.

These numbers are relatively small, but nevertheless cause for worry. Increasing numbers of students are at risk of being barred, and increasing numbers of students are enrolling in one, two, or three additional entry-level writing classes after their initial ELWR section of the college Core class.

The effect of this increase is felt primarily by the Writing Program, which has a fixed TAS budget (13 FTE as of 2006-07) to cover the salaries of the large group of Non-Senate Faculty (NSF) who primarily staff the classes. The math is straightforward: the more ELWR classes the Writing Program offers, the less money there is to fund the first-year writing course (Writing 1/Writing 2) that 80% of any incoming class is required to take after having satisfied the ELWR. The Writing Program has a record of effectively and cost-efficiently helping students meet the ELWR without hindering their progress to degree, by teaching them in university-level writing courses (rather than diverting students into non-credit-bearing courses or into a separate track of pre-ELWR "ESL")

courses); nevertheless, the changing needs of the first-year student population place an increasing claim on an inelastic TAS budget.

In order to address these problems, the Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) is making the following recommendations for changes to the campus ELWR curriculum:

1. Require that all first-year students who fail to satisfy the ELWR at the end of their first quarter of enrollment enroll in at least one additional writing course (Writing 20) during their first year, as per Divisional Regulation 10.5.2, which requires students to continue enrolling in “Subject A” (now ELWR) classes until they satisfy the ELWR (or are barred). Enrollment in such classes has been treated as a strong recommendation, not a requirement, until now.
2. Enhance language instruction for ELL students.
3. Restore, with 2 units of workload credit, Writing 10A, 10B, 10C—enrolled tutorials, for students concurrently in ELWR classes, that were cancelled when the Writing Program’s funding for tutoring was cut in 2003.
4. Sponsor seed funds for a longitudinal study of student writing.

Our analysis estimates that these changes could be achieved with a modest campus investment of roughly **\$42,350** in the first year, and **\$38,500** per year thereafter.

A revised ELWR curriculum that more directly meets the needs of the most at-risk population of students will likely have several salutary effects. The changes will:

- Decrease the number of students barred, thus improving the campus’s first- and second-year retention rates;
- Speed the progress of students needing more than one quarter to satisfy the ELWR;
- Better equip under-prepared students to meet the challenges of university-level writing and increase their chances for success in courses across the curriculum.

The question of retention is currently high on UCSC’s agenda. The campus is evidently doing a better job of retaining its less well-prepared students than its top students, but all successful efforts at retention will serve student, and campus, needs. The seemingly small number of students at risk of being barred for ELWR after four quarters at UCSC (42 in fall 2005) is nevertheless significant: it could reduce one-year retention rates posted by IRPS by 1.5 percentage points, and would have an even greater impact on the retention rates of some underrepresented ethnic minorities. These students contribute significantly to economic, ethnic and linguistic diversity at UCSC, an acclaimed priority of the Chancellor and Academic Senate. Having earned admission to UC, they deserve our full support in overcoming shortcomings in their high school preparation and preparing them to succeed at UCSC.

Intervening at the front end of students' university education will help them get over one bar to retention, the ELWR. Given the university's standard for writing proficiency, the ELWR can be seen as a process for ensuring that resources are directed toward students who need them; indeed, the annual UCOP Report on ELWR notes that "the purpose of the [entry-level writing] assessment is to ensure that students have the writing skills necessary to succeed in UC level courses in their first two years," by "placement in appropriate English composition courses." Front-loading instructional support for ELL and other basic writers puts them on track to retention and success before they begin to fail, become discouraged, accept limited options in their studies, or settle for mediocrity. Most significant in terms of impact on the campus as a whole, providing resources at the front end will help these students more quickly write successfully on a campus that expects writing competence among its students.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

UCSC's ELWR Curriculum

Entering UCSC students held for the ELWR enroll in designated sections of their college Core classes (College 80A) taught mainly by trained writing instructors. Twenty-four of these courses are funded by the Writing Program; the remainder—about 25-30 annually—are funded by the colleges. New first-quarter students identified as ELL writers are also encouraged to enroll in Writing 22A, a 3-unit grammar workshop designed to piggy-back on their work in Core classes and requiring no original papers. In the past several years, the Writing Program has offered three sections of Writing 22A each fall, paid for by Learning Support Services and Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP).

Students who still need to satisfy the ELWR after one quarter on campus have several more ELWR-related courses they can take, all offered by the Writing Program. Writing 20 (The Nature of Written Discourse) in the winter and Writing 21 (Meaning and Style: The Sentence in Context) in spring are both 5-unit courses requiring papers. Writing 22B (Grammar and Editing Workshop), offered for 4th-quarter students who still need to satisfy the ELWR, is a 3-unit language workshop requiring no original papers but designed to support students' writing in concurrently-enrolled disciplinary courses. It offers practice in recognizing and editing common patterns of error, and takes as texts the writing students do in concurrent courses requiring papers.

Tutoring support is available to ELWR students on a fee-for-service basis, with fee waivers available to students already eligible for such waivers and free writing assistance available to EOP students. Until funding cuts imposed in 2003, the Writing Program was able to support free tutoring for all students enrolled in ELWR classes, via workload-credit tutorials (Writing 10A, 10B, 10C) that were cut concurrently with funding. Participation in tutoring was then close to 100%.

Current ELWR Course Offerings

	Fall (1 st quarter)	Winter	Spring	Fall (4 th quarter)
5-unit writing courses	Core 80A (approx. 50 sections) + tutoring recommended (formerly required)	Writing 20 (elective: ¹ 10-12 sections) + tutoring	Writing 21 (elective: 3-4 sections) + tutoring	
3-unit language workshops	Writing 22A (3 sections)			Writing 22B (elective: 2 sections) + tutoring

In 2004-05, with a fall freshperson enrollment of 3,122, the Writing Program offered 10 sections of Writing 20 and 3 sections of Writing 21. In 2005-06, despite a drop in fall freshperson enrollment to 2,950, the Writing Program has had to offer 12 sections of Writing 20 and 4 sections of Writing 21.

Unlike most other UC campuses, aside from Writing 22A and Writing 22B, UCSC offers no courses specifically for ELL students, nor is there a separate “ESL” program. ELL students are integrated into the regular Core and Writing curricula. (As students move through the ELWR curriculum, however, the percentage of ELL, bilingual and other language-minority students per course increases considerably.) This practice has effectively taught ELL students without stigmatizing or marginalizing them by putting them in a separate track of courses. But it places special pressure on the Writing Program to provide instruction suited to students with language challenges. As California’s population has changed, increasing numbers of students enter UCSC needing to develop greater proficiency in standard written English, a responsibility borne solely by the Writing Program.

UCOPE Recommendation on Class Size

UC’s systemwide Committee on Preparatory English has acknowledged the need to strengthen curricular support for the growing ELWR population. A recent recommendation from UCOPE, endorsed by UCEP and Academic Council Chair George Blumenthal, recommended that classes helping students satisfy the ELWR be capped systemwide at a maximum of 20. As of 2004, only three of the (then) eight UC campuses serving undergraduates met this cap; of those, only one, UC Berkeley, met or bettered

¹ Writing 20, 21, and 22B have been de facto electives because Divisional Regulation 10.5.2 has not been enforced.

UCOPE's recommended target cap of 15 per ELWR class.² UCSC caps its ELWR classes at 22. In practice, this means that the Writing Program enrolls Writing 20, 21, and 22A/B at 22 students per course. College Core classes for ELWR-liable students are enrolled according to standards set at the colleges; anecdotal information suggests that college-enrolled ELWR classes range from 18 (a few) to 22. The Academic Council, reported Chair Blumenthal, "agrees with the committees' conclusion" to cap classes at a maximum of 20 "because of the unique value of writing classes and the unusual demands of writing instruction," and found the estimated systemwide cost of \$270,000 to be a "reasonable amount in light of what may be gained in effectiveness and broad educational benefits."

If this recommendation is implemented by UCOP, funds will pass through to the individual campuses, including UCSC, and so should not increase pressure on the budgets of either the Writing Program or the colleges, the units sponsoring ELWR-related courses. Though reducing class size would inevitably mean offering more sections of certain classes, it is likely that reduced class size will lead to greater student success in the earlier classes in the ELWR series. Thus, though we estimate that a decrease in class size would mean an increase of 3-4 in the number of Writing Program ELWR classes needed (1-2 in winter, and one apiece in spring and fall, the latter for fourth-quarter students), it is possible that the addition of only a single section of Writing 20 (a second-quarter ELWR class) would help improve students' chances of satisfying the ELWR in two (College 80A plus Writing 20) rather than three or four classes. College Core classes devoted to ELWR would also be affected by this change, though the effect on number of classes is a bit harder to estimate. Some colleges run ELWR sections smaller than 22 students already; also, as these classes are formula-funded, incremental decreases in the sizes of ELWR sections may be absorbed by incremental increases in the sizes of non-ELWR sections, up to a cap of 24.

No formal study has been conducted at UCSC to assess the effect of increase of class size on success rates (e.g., passage of the ELWR, success in subsequent classes requiring writing). But research conducted and recommendations offered on a national level have amply supported the conclusion that class size affects student learning. CPE would welcome the endorsements by the Academic Senate and of campus administration of this Academic Council-approved shift in ELWR class size.

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGES TO ELWR CURRICULUM

Though reducing class size in ELWR courses would unquestionably benefit students, the particular circumstances of UCSC's ELWR program, and especially its services for ELL and other multilingual students, require additional curricular change as well.

² UC Berkeley's 14-student classes are unique in the system. They offer 6 graduation credits and help students simultaneously satisfy the ELWR and the first half of UCB's composition requirement, making the classes particularly efficient. (UCSC's ELWR sections of Core help students satisfy the C1 requirement in time with their classmates; thus, like Berkeley's classes, students may satisfy the ELWR and the first half of the campus composition requirement simultaneously.)

Recommendation #1: Require Writing 20 of students who do not satisfy the ELWR by end of first quarter of enrollment, and enforce Divisional Regulation 10.5.2 requiring continued enrollment in ELWR classes until the requirement is satisfied.³

CPE recommends that students who don't satisfy the ELWR in College 80A should be required to enroll in ELWR classes until they satisfy the requirement. In practice, for students who remain ELWR-liable at the end of fall quarter, this would mean requiring Writing 20. (Students who take winter quarter off would simply enroll in Writing 21 in the spring.) This measure would increase the likelihood of all students' passing the ELWR in four quarters, as taking a writing course immediately after College 80A would help students retain what they've already learned and build on it. It would also mean that a number of students who currently sit out Writing 20 (winter) in favor of Writing 21 (spring) would satisfy sooner, and get on with other requirements such as C2.

The current status of ELWR classes as (de facto) elective rather than required has unnecessarily hindered the progress through General Education requirements of many of these students, and put some at risk of failing to satisfy ELWR within the allowed four quarters. Statistics compiled by ELWR coordinator Maria Cecilia Freeman indicate that of the 42 students at risk of being barred in fall 2005, 18 had declined to enroll in any post-Core writing course during their first year. Five of the 18 were barred at the end of fall, and the others were unnecessarily delayed in their progress to degree. By insisting on continued enrollment in ELWR classes, this proposed change would ensure that the most challenged students will have a contiguous two-course sequence and the spring course will have a more homogeneous population—mostly ELL students—which would allow more effective instruction.

- **Policy implications:** None: required enrollment in ELWR classes is already on the books as Divisional Regulation 10.5.2.
- **Resource implications:** At 22 students per class, the current class limit for the ELWR series, we estimate the Writing Program would need an additional 3 sections of Writing 20. (The Writing Program usually runs 10-12 sections each winter). At \$7700 (including benefits) per lecturer-taught class, the additional classes would cost about **\$23,100**. (For per-course cost, see Appendix A, CPB's recent report on the Writing Program's finances, p. 7.) Should the Academic Council proposal on ELWR class size reduction go through, there would likely be need for a fourth new section, but that cost would be covered by UCOP. The cost of additional sections of Writing 20 might be offset by a small reduction in the number of sections of Writing 21 in the spring (currently 3-4 annually) as students satisfy the ELWR earlier than they currently do.

³ This Regulation requires continued enrollment in ELWR classes within the time-frame imposed by UC policy. At UCSC, students must satisfy the requirement by the end of their fourth quarter or be barred from further enrollment.

Resource implications also include the effect of any change in policy on advising staff. College advisors and preceptors would bear much of the weight of reminding students to enroll. College 80A instructors would of course play a role as well, as would the ELWR Coordinator, whose job would expand to track down those students who don't immediately enroll.

Finally, requiring Writing 20 might have consequences as well within certain departments whose major requirements entail a fixed sequence of courses. A disproportionate number of first-year students in Writing 20 believe that they will major in Social Sciences (33% in 2006) or Physical and Biological Sciences (26%). Several majors in those divisions have relatively high numbers of required courses and a relatively fixed pathway through them. Cooperation with these programs would be essential in capturing their students for Writing 20 and ensuring that college and departmental advising were not in conflict with each other.⁴

Recommendation #2: Enhance language instruction for ELL students.

The current group of ELWR-related classes has proven insufficient to meet the needs of those students most at risk of being barred from further enrollment because of their writing.

Of the 42 fourth-quarter students with a hold on their further enrollment in fall 2005, 33 enrolled in Writing 22B (3-unit Grammar and Editing Workshop). However, the workshop and the configuration of courses that preceded it were insufficient in different ways for overlapping segments of the class: both ELL students who needed more intensive writing practice that also incorporated language instruction, and students who needed primarily the rhetorical and writing process instruction offered in a full 5-unit writing course. Six students in Writing 22B failed and were barred, while some who met the ELWR passed only marginally—a serious concern because only minimal support is available to students once they satisfy the ELWR.⁵

⁴ These issues are already under consideration by the “At-Risk Students Committee” convened by Learning Support Services Director Holly Gritsch de Cordova. Suggestions that have emerged in those discussions include creating a written advising protocol for all preceptors and advisors, explaining about ELWR and the courses, since not all of them are well-informed. They are also talking about ways to make first-year advising more timely and consistent to help students manage competing pressures from the ELWR and their majors. Advisors might even make more use of “Advising Holds” that require students to come in and talk with them in order to enroll.

⁵ Tutoring support has been much diminished in recent years. The Writing Program has no funds available for tutoring. EOP/Learning Support Services provides tutoring to EOP students; EOP/LSS and several of the colleges also provide drop-in tutoring, and a program of “modified supplemental instruction”—peer-led workshops—attached to certain larger courses with a history of high failure rate. Overall, there are relatively few services available to the general student population, and even fewer to those students whose extended ELWR histories do not include EOP status.

Though there are a number of reasons students find themselves at risk of being barred, the single largest group of students in this category are ELL/bilingual writers. Currently, the only courses specifically targeting ELL writers are the grammar and editing workshops for first-quarter (Writing 22A) and fourth-quarter (Writing 22B) students. CPE proposes to add a 3-unit Writing 22B workshop in the second quarter linked with Writing 20, and to transform the fourth-quarter offering into a 5-unit course requiring papers, Writing 23.

Adding language workshop courses (by instructor recommendation) in the second quarter to piggy-back on Writing 20 would help ELL students gain greater control over their writing and editing, and thus better equip them to succeed in courses requiring writing. Requiring Writing 20 as a prerequisite to Writing 21 (Recommendation #1) will mean that Writing 21 will be populated almost exclusively by students with considerable language challenges, and the course plan could thus integrate the kind of grammar and editing practice that would otherwise be supplemental in a Writing 22 workshop. Finally, transforming the final course in the ELWR series into a full-fledged writing course (Writing 23) would recognize the considerable need for additional writing practice experienced by students who have been unable to satisfy the ELWR after three previous writing courses. The Writing Program is already at work developing a new course proposal for Writing 23, and hopes to offer two sections of this course in lieu of the workshop course in fall 2006.

Proposed ELWR Course Offerings⁶

In the following chart, changes proposed to current ELWR offerings are bold-faced.

	Fall (1 st quarter)	Winter	Spring	Fall (4 th quarter)
5-unit writing courses	Core 80A (approx. 50 sections) + tutoring/ Writing 10A	Writing 20 (required: 13-16 sections) + tutoring/ Writing 10 B	Writing 21 (2-4 sections) + tutoring/ Writing 10C	Writing 23 (1-2 sections) + tutoring
3-unit language workshops	Writing 22A (3 sections)	Writing 22B (2 sections)		

⁶ Number of sections varies, most notably among the Writing 20 classes, for two reasons. (1) Fall ELWR pass rates determine the number of students who might be required to take Writing 20. If incoming classes include higher numbers of ELL students, as is likely, we should expect higher numbers of Writing 20 sections. (2) If the Academic Council’s recommendation on ELWR class size is approved, the number of sections needed will increase accordingly. These reasons will also affect the number of spring courses needed. If students no longer have the option of skipping Writing 20 in favor of Writing 21, more students will satisfy the ELWR sooner, possibly reducing the minimum number of Writing 21 classes needed from 3-4 annually to 2-3.

This would be the full ELWR sequence. In the first quarter, Writing 22A enrollment priority would be for new ELL frosh in Core. In the second quarter, Writing 22B enrollment priority would be for ELL students concurrently enrolled in Writing 20. In the fourth quarter (fall), Writing 23 enrollment priority would be for 4th-quarter ELWR students, and potentially open to others by interview.

- **Resource implications:** The expected cost of adding two workshop classes (winter Writing 22Bs) and transforming the two fourth-quarter workshop classes into 5-unit writing classes (fall Writing 22Bs shifted to Writing 23s) should be about equivalent to adding two additional 5-unit courses: about **\$15,400** including benefits (two 3-unit classes plus two units apiece added to two existing 3-unit classes).
- **Additional resources:** As has already been the case, we expect both Writing 22A and the new winter Writing 22B would attract additional groups of students beyond those targeted here: transfers, EAP, re-entry, and other bilingual students who want the support and reassurance of a grammar/editing review. International graduate students have also sought out these workshops. Additional funding may be available from EOP, LSS, and Services for Transfer and Re-Entry Students (STARS)—and possibly even the Graduate Division—to support either special sections for these students, or to help pay for existing sections.

Recommendation #3: Restore Writing 10A, 10B, 10C with 2 workload credits.

Learning Support Services has proposed to fund writing assistance for all ELWR students via student registration fees. This proposal is currently under review by the Student Fee Advisory Committee and should be ruled on by the end of the academic year. We are hoping for a favorable outcome. Should the funding become available, we would also like to propose the restoration of enrollment in Writing 10A (fall), 10B (winter), and 10C (spring), tutorials taken for workload credit only concurrently with College 80A, Writing 20, and Writing 21. (Should the Student Fee Advisory Committee not provide funding, we will rework this proposal to include funding for tutoring and restoration of Writing 10.)

Through 2002-03, the Writing Program, with the support of the EOP program, was able to support tutorials of up to 5 hours per quarter for all students held for the ELWR (then called Subject A). (EOP's budget allowed up to 20 hours for eligible students, an allowance that still stands today.) The tutoring, conducted by trained peer writing assistants, counted as a tutorial: students received 2 units of workload credit and signed up for a course, Writing 10A, B, or C, whose instructor of record was the instructor of their ELWR-related course. Though not required, Writing 10 was universally expected of all ELWR students, and the tutorial offered two significant advantages: (1) concentrated supplemental work with a trained tutor helped students more effectively develop their ideas and revise their papers; practices portable to their writing for other courses; and (2) workload credit enabled the most at-risk students to limit the number of full-credit courses they were taking to two without jeopardizing their eligibility for financial aid. Though not a direct benefit of Writing 10 enrollment, the freedom to focus on writing proficiency was particularly useful to students who also enrolled in Writing

22A, the 3-unit grammar and editing workshop, as it allowed ELL students to concentrate on their writing without overloading their schedules.

As previously noted, both universally available writing assistance for ELWR students and the workload-credit Writing 10 enrollments ceased in fall 2002. (Free writing assistance continues for EOP students only.) In their place, with the considerable technical and administrative assistance of Learning Support Services (LSS), the Writing Program has offered a fee-for-service program of writing assistance. Fee waivers are available for students already eligible for such waivers. LSS reports that 922 students in fall 2005 availed themselves of tutoring services, including students whose fees were waived—about 80-85% of students enrolled in ELWR sections of college Core classes. This is a solid percentage but still a considerable drop-off from the near-100% enrollments of previous years.

Until 2002, Writing 10 tutorials—enrolling all ELWR students across the board for workload credit at no additional cost—were an integral part of UCSC’s successful ELWR “program of study” as mandated by Senate Regulation 636G. Tutors, many of whom are considering teaching careers, are rigorously trained to help students learn “to read thoughtfully and to provide reasoned, concrete, and developed presentations of their points of view” in their essays (to use the words of the Information Booklet for the Universitywide ELWR). Anecdotally, the shift to an elective fee-for-service plan has negatively impacted the program in a number of ways. Significantly, this important one-on-one supplemental instructional support has become available only to students who can afford the additional fee (or who qualify for fee waivers); many other students decline the additional cost. (Some report being financially stretched themselves or reluctant to ask their parents to come up with more money; some report that parents are unwilling or unable to pay more.) In effect, the optional fee-for-service plan denies equal access to the resources of the university to students who have been admitted and are held to the same time limit on the ELWR as others. Restoring the Writing 10 series for workload credit will also help students treat the work they do on their writing via the writing assistance program as an essential part of the academic program shared by all ELWR students, rather than as an extra service for some. And restoring the tutorials as an organic part of the ELWR program of study, with enrollment and participation expected of all ELWR students, is likely to boost the pass rate.

- **Policy implications:** There should be no policy implications for the restoration of Writing 10 for workload credit. ELWR-related courses, including Writing 10, are university-level courses and thus not subject to the funding restrictions placed on remedial work. (State funds are not to be used for “remedial” courses.) Indeed, ELWR courses at UCSC expressly do not meet the definition of “remediation” included in Senate Regulation 761B, which defines “remedial work in English...as work primarily focused on topics in spelling, punctuation and usage, and in the basic structures of sentences, paragraphs, and short essays.” Instead, in accord with UCOP’s published goals for ELWR, our courses “require students to read and understand extended and often difficult texts, sometimes literary but often not, and to write substantial essays...about issues raised in those texts.” The Writing 10 tutorials

support the ELWR course work asking students to write focused analytical responses to reading on a level of difficulty typical of beginning university courses.

- **Resource implications:** No obvious resource implications.

Recommendation #4: Sponsor seed funds for longitudinal study of student writing.

Until recently, by the measure of number of courses and services offered, UCSC effectively met the needs of incoming students at all levels whose writing skills spanned the spectrum. Recent years, however, have seen the suspension of upper-division writing classes, contraction of funding for tutoring, and diminishing resources for writing support in the disciplines. These changes have taken place at the same time as the population of the state of California has shifted, bringing more ELL students into UCSC's incoming classes, and also at the same time as UCSC has begun to boost enrollments by increasing the number of transfer students (and the ratio of transfer students to incoming frosh). CPE strongly recommends investing funds to study the impact of these changes on undergraduate education and retention.

Some of the questions we see as urgent include the following: How effective is UCSC at retaining students who initially enroll without having satisfied the ELWR? For those students who need 3-4 quarters to satisfy the ELWR, does ELWR status affect time to degree? Does writing skill—or perception of writing skill—affect students' choice of major or their performance in their majors?

CPB's recent report on the Writing Program made a similar, if more limited, call for study. Noting that "at present, Institutional Research does not track students or courses in a way that allows for the best planning at the campus level." CPB indicated that "differences concerning the adequacy of resources can only be resolved with data that tracks students—noting, for instance, how, when, and where they satisfy their writing requirements" (Appendix B, 8). CPE endorses this call and recommends that the campus invest sufficient funds to study the role of campus writing instruction on such campus priorities as diversity, retention, and time to degree. CPE requests that the central administration should sponsor at least the starting phase of a study examining the impact of writing on student success at UCSC.

- **Policy implications:** Administrative or Senate committee (CPB, CEP) will need to be given authority for reporting on the results of this study to the campus, which needs to be on-going and longitudinal in focus.
- **Resource implications:** We request a minimal initial outlay of .5 course equivalency, or roughly \$3850, including benefits, for an advanced Writing Program lecturer to research and develop a proposal for the study of the issue that is likely to be funded by an outside agency.

FUNDING RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO ELWR CURRICULUM

CPE here recommends a number of relatively modest curricular changes, plus a small investment in what we hope will become a larger study of student writing at UCSC. Most of the roughly **\$42,350** that we request for these investments would be devoted to increasing the number of classes offered in the ELWR curriculum, a cost we believe should be borne by the central administration, not the Humanities Division. If the 2005-06 statistics are an accurate measure—and we believe they are—most of the students who take more than one ELWR-related course identify themselves as majoring in a field either in Physical and Biological Sciences or Social Sciences. (Of the 250 Writing 20 students in winter 2005, 59% identified majors in either PBSci or SocSci. By contrast, only 6% apiece identified themselves as Humanities, Arts, or Engineering majors.)

For the same reason, CPE believes that the campus should return to funding writing classes by enrollment-based formula, a recommendation also made by CPB in its recent report (Appendix B, 8, 9). Currently, in addition to the hard-funded courses taught by Security of Employment Lecturers, all Writing Program classes are funded out of the 12 FTE of Temporary Academic Staffing funds that constitute the Writing Program's annual curricular budget.⁷ Together, these funds must cover the cost of providing enough Writing 1/Writing 2 courses to meet the needs of incoming students who need to satisfy the C2 composition requirement—about 80% of the incoming freshman class annually. They must also cover the cost of any ELWR classes the Writing Program offers. An increase in the number of ELWR classes does not mean a corresponding decrease in the number of C2 courses required. Any fluctuation in size of incoming class or character of incoming class (e.g., more ELL students) will affect the number of ELWR classes the Writing Program needs to offer and thus affect the funds available to run required C2 courses. Enrollment-based formula funding would alleviate the insecurities currently inherent in mounting the required campus writing curriculum.

CONCLUSION

UCSC's increasing population of language-minority students is having a noticeable effect on the campus. These students add richly to the climate of diversity UCSC is striving to develop, and help our campus better reflect California's demographics. Their increasing numbers are also straining the writing curriculum that is currently available to them. Student demand is driving up the number of courses the Writing Program must offer to help students satisfy the Entry-Level Writing Requirement, thus affecting the funding of courses that meet the campus composition requirements, C1 and C2. As important, the

⁷ The Writing Program's allocation of TAS has been increased to 13 FTE as of 2006-07. The increase should cover the cost of unfunded merit increases for lecturers that the Humanities Division has until now shouldered. But even with this increase, TAS funds do not cover the Writing Program's full course load. EOP/Learning Support Services have, together, paid for every section of Writing 22A and Writing 159 the Writing Program has offered in recent years, and essential sections of Writing 1/2 have been funded from unstable sources such as gift funds and revenue from Summer Session courses.

current curriculum was designed with fewer students and generally greater proficiency in standard written English in mind. The curricular changes CPE proposes should improve retention rates among ethnically and racially diverse students, speed their progress through the ELWR, and better prepare them to communicate successfully in the academy and in their subsequent careers. CPE feels that the modest cost of implementing this proposal is an excellent investment in meeting urgent campus concerns.

The status of ELL, bilingual, and other language-minority students in California in recent years has been of sufficient concern that the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California (ICAS) has recently taken it up. In a draft of ICAS's report on the subject received by the systemwide Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE), the writers conclude as follows:

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.

UCSC's language-minority students have met the standards of admission to the University of California, and deserve the best efforts of the campus to help them satisfy their requirements beyond minimum levels of competence. As the ICAS report suggests, addressing head-on the challenge posed by this population will benefit the campus at all levels, and indeed California as a whole. CPE believes that this proposal will help our campus take a much-needed step in adequately funding and supporting a program that meets the needs of a significant and growing set of linguistically diverse students on campus.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee on Preparatory Education would like to thank VP/DUE William Ladusaw, Dean Gary Lease, LSS Director Holly Cordova and the committees on Educational Policy and Planning and Budget for their comments on an earlier draft of this report.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

Elizabeth Abrams

Judith Scott

Judith Habicht-Mauche, Chair

Maria Cecilia Freeman, NSF Representative

May 4, 2006