The CATESOL Journal

ROBBY CHING
California State University, Sacramento
REBECCA FORD
Sacramento City College
SUE MCKEE
California State University, Sacramento

Passages Between the Community College and the California State University System

The framework for higher education in California, the Master Plan (Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, 1987), establishes three routes for students to pursue their lower division postsecondary coursework. Students can attend a California State University (CSU) if they rank in the upper one third of California high school graduates[1] and have completed a prescribed set of 15 college preparatory courses (the a-f requirements, see Appendix A in Lane, Brinton, & Erickson, this volume). Students in the upper one eighth can attend a University of California (UC) campus. All other students who are 18 years old and hold a high school diploma or can demonstrate "an ability to benefit" from instruction can attend a California community college (Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, 1987, pp. 14-15). According to the Master Plan, all three groups of students, after having completed their general education coursework, will be at the same point—ready to commence upper division general education courses and required courses in their majors at a four-year university.

This vision has never meshed well with reality. The disjunction between the community colleges and the CSU is especially crucial since so many CSU students—up to 80% on some CSU campuses—begin their education in a community college. The CSU, despite its relative selectivity, has always admitted fairly large numbers of underprepared students in order to ensure a student population that reflects the state's diversity. In addition to those students who do not meet regular admission criteria, substantial numbers of regularly admitted students cannot demonstrate college-level skills in the areas of either math or English and are placed in developmental programs.[2] For example, on one urban CSU campus, eight

out of 10 students needed precollege-level English. Overall the CSU spends $10 million (or 0.6% of their total budget) to teach needed English and math skills to underprepared students (Richardson, 1995).

The community colleges, however, as open admission institutions, face a much more daunting task. Community colleges have multiple missions which are sometimes in conflict. Their primary task is to prepare students to transfer to the CSU or UC; however, they also have to prepare students for jobs through vocational programs and to serve students who are enrolled simply to improve themselves and who have neither job training nor transfer goals. They must serve all students, including those with minimal literacy skills in English. Finally, community college faculty work under more difficult conditions than their CSU colleagues—larger class sizes for basic skills classes, a higher proportion of part-time faculty, and fewer resources for the coordination of teachers and curriculum.

The differences in the population, mission, and conditions between the CSU and the community colleges result in community college ESL students who transfer to the CSU with widely differing skill levels. Some are indistinguishable from their peers who began as freshmen in the CSU, but many come underprepared for upper division university-level work. They discover that they lack the proficiency in English to meet upper division writing requirements and—although they may not see this—to truly benefit from the programs the university has to offer.

For these ESL students who are underprepared, the transition between community college and the CSU is often a rocky one. The Master Plan set up a system in which the CSU and community colleges function as separate entities and where most campuses, programs, and even teachers function autonomously, and yet in which student outcomes are somehow expected to be equivalent. This article will explore what happens in the community colleges and the CSU to account for the mismatch between two supposedly equivalent systems of higher education and suggest ways in which the vision of the Master Plan can be brought closer to reality. It will further consider the issue of inconsistency within segments—that is, students taking equivalent courses on different campuses do not necessarily receive comparable instruction or meet comparable standards.

L2 Assessment in the Community Colleges

At the community college level the many differences among ESL programs begin with the placement processes. Although individual community colleges may have worked out appropriate L2 placement and other assessment practices for their particular institutional context, assessment practices vary throughout the system. Moreover, no attempt is made to match community college assessment with that in the CSU. It is no wonder that students, who often move between several institutions during their college years, are bewildered, frustrated, and sometimes angry at the mixed messages they receive.

Students attending community colleges are required to be assessed for their English and math skills upon entry. The community college system has mandated that all instruments used in this endeavor be approved by the chancellor's office (State of California, 1993; see Garlow, this volume). Therefore, all tests are rigorously reviewed for their validity, reliability, fairness, and appropriateness to the students and curricula. ESL tests are no exception; they must demonstrate that they are valid, that they are a good match for the course content for which they are to be used, and that they are normed on a population of ESL students similar to that found in the college (California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office, 1995).

However, only a single standardized test has received full approval status for ESL placement from the community college chancellor's office. The Combined English Language Skills Assessment (CELSA) is a multiple-choice cloze test which focuses on grammar. It does not include a measure of reading readiness, a writing sample, and as yet has no oral/aural component. Some faculty have identified the lack of a writing sample as an impediment to effectively placing students in the upper levels of their programs. The staff of the state chancellor's office in 1990 also regarded the inclusion of a writing sample in ESL placement tests as essential (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 1990). Similarly, they stated that "an oral/aural test is an essential part of a placement battery. The omission of a speaking test may result in the misplacement of students" (p. 3). The CELSA by itself is not a good match for the diverse ESL offerings throughout the state. To compensate for these difficulties with the CELSA, many colleges have devised their own instruments or adapted other published tests and had those approved for their individual campus use, an endeavor that requires considerable work on the part of the college. However, this local testing results in a lack of standardization and means that the same student might be placed in courses at different levels on different campuses. Since neither placement nor programs are aligned across the state, it is not surprising that students finish their composition programs at very different levels also.

The greatest obstacle to the successful testing and placement of ESL students in the community college system, however, is that there is no mechanism for assuring that ESL students take the carefully scrutinized ESL tests. For a variety of reasons, many students opt to take the test designed for native speakers. Oral fluency, which usually develops much

more quickly than academic reading and writing skills, may lead counselors to think students are more advanced that they really are. Some, not realizing the length of time needed to develop proficiency in a second language, may feel that ESL classes are actually a barrier to student success in the community college; they may also respond sympathetically to students' desires to move through their programs as quickly as possible because of financial and other pressures. The students themselves may be operating on the premise that they have finished ESL in high school or feel a stigma attached to ESL. These students are able to bypass ESL programs altogether and typically end up taking developmental courses designed for native speakers. The instructors of these classes, most of whom are not trained in teaching ESL, may find it difficult to deal with the many second language syntactic and semantic features encountered in students' writing and often do not understand the issues involved in second language acquisition. Later, these students may transfer to CSU or UC having met the English course requirements but without having had second language issues addressed in those courses.

Common exit standards have often been suggested as a solution to students taking inappropriate language classes. Setting those standards is possible, but deciding how to measure whether students have achieved them is not so easy. Unlike the CSU system which mandates the Graduate Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR), the community colleges have no exit criteria or assessment. In fact, exit tests, unless they are part of the course grade, are expressly prohibited (State of California, 1993). Some campuses do give a common final examination as part of the final grade in certain courses, and at least one community college has a requirement that students have passing scores on a majority of inclass writing assignments in order to pass ESL writing courses (Sacramento City College, English Department, 1995). Most colleges, however, lack the resources needed to put such a testing process in place, leaving teachers to use their individual criteria in assigning grades. Lack of common exit standards from level to level means that students succeeding in a course taught by one teacher may not have attained skills comparable to students succeeding in what should be a similar course taught by another teacher. The community college system as a whole has not viewed making standards consistent between campuses as a priority (see California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office, 1990, Appendix C.2).

One step to address the issue of common standards is inherent in the community college requirements for establishing prerequisites. In the same way that community college placement instruments must be proved valid, course prerequisites also have to be shown to be necessary for student success. To satisfy this mandate in ESL programs, ESL faculty must collaboratively list the entrance skills required to succeed in ESL 2, for example, and the exit skills expected from students succeeding in the prerequisite course, ESL 1 (State of California, 1993). Once the identification of these skills is established at a nucleus of colleges, standards from campus to campus should become more consistent.

L2 Assessment in the CSU

Lower Division

L2 students in the CSU are not identified as ESL during the admission process. Both L1 and L2 students entering the CSU, unless exempt, must take the English Placement Test (EPT). Although the test asks students to indicate if their first language is not English, most campuses do not use this information. Campuses that wish to place students into ESL courses cannot rely solely on EPT results and often must retest L2 students locally. Practices vary widely. Some campuses do not retest and offer the same developmental coursework to all students regardless of language background. Others offer special courses for international students only; yet others offer a series of courses for students who can benefit from specialized ESL instruction parallel to those for native speakers. As in the community colleges, some L2 students resist being classified as ESL, and some English teachers and counselors view ESL courses as unnecessary obstacles and therefore direct students to courses for native speakers.

After students are placed by the EPT, no further systemwide efforts are made to ensure that students complete their freshman composition program with equivalent skills. Some CSU programs achieve a fairly high level of programmatic coherence through "common examinations, common writing projects, structured course sequencing, regular meetings of faculty involved with the program, instructor handbooks keyed to exams, coordination of syllabi and materials and 'holistic' student evaluation by instructors" (California State University, Committee on Education Policy, 1992, p. 10). However, despite these efforts, individual precollege-level courses are not articulated with the corresponding courses among CSU campuses or in the community colleges.

Upper Division

The ultimate checkpoint for writing skills in the CSU is the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR). Instituted by the trustees to test writing proficiency at the junior level, it is called by different names on different campuses—for example, the Writing Proficiency Exam,

the Graduate Writing Exam, and the Writing Skills Test. A survey conducted by the authors in fall 1995 documents the differences in the implementation of the GWAR among the 23 CSU campuses (see Appendix A). Because each CSU campus determines the means to meet the requirement, proficiency is demonstrated in different ways on different campuses (see Appendix B). On most campuses students satisfy the requirement by taking a test; at some they take a test to place into a course which they must pass; at others they may choose a test or a course. Although all CSU students are held to the GWAR, there is no systemwide consistency in how L2 students meet this requirement.

Different campuses accommodate L2 students in satisfying the GWAR in a variety of ways. Some allow extra time for nonnative speakers (30 minutes to 1-1/2 hours more). At one campus international students returning to their home country can pass with a lower score (10 instead of 14 out of a possible 24 points). At some campuses some accommodation occurs in the grading session; this may be done by informal means (as one coordinator said, ". . .there tends to be more leeway given for mechanical errors/mistakes in the writings of nonnative speakers" (personal communication, 1995). Often campuses ask ESL students to self-identify so that "readers are aware of this when evaluating and scoring the exam," as another coordinator noted (personal communication, 1995). At other readings ESL papers are read separately by ESL instructors.

Despite these accommodations, ESL students in institutions which keep statistics (about half the group) fail the GWAR in much larger numbers than native speakers (see Table 1).

Table 1
CSU GWAR Pass Rates

CSU 1	Overall 70%	ESL 40%
CSU 2	Non-ESL 85%	ESL 60%
CSU 3	Native Speakers 75%	Nonnative speakers . .50%
CSU 4	Overall 81%	ESL 52%
CSU 5	Non-ESL 70%	ESL 50%

Although ESL students are clearly having a problem fulfilling the GWAR, the extent of the problem is difficult to document precisely because campuses do not identify L2 students or collect data about them in a consistent way.

Are students' problems compounded by the lack of coordination between courses they have taken (or avoided) along the way? Most coordinators say the perception among their faculty is that community college course articulation is a problem, but very few have any concrete data on the issue. In a survey conducted at one campus at each exam administration, however, students who report that they took their freshman composition class (English 1A) at a community college generally fail at a somewhat higher rate than students who reported taking that class at a CSU, UC, or private university (California State University, Sacramento, English Department, 1995).

Whatever their route, L2 students have difficulty meeting the GWAR at the CSU (Asian Pacific American Advisory Committee, 1994). Individual campus coordinators and faculty must struggle with ways to give L2 students the skills they need to satisfy this requirement at this late date in their academic life, but the entire ESL teaching community needs to look at long-term solutions that will enable students to be better prepared before they encounter this checkpoint just before graduation.

Issues of Reclassification

A complication that exists not only at the time students take the GWAR but throughout their educational career is that L2 students are not identified in any consistent way, resulting in students moving back and forth between ESL and native speaker classes as they progress through the high school, community college, and university systems. Often L2 students, who may have begun their K–12 education classified as limited English proficient (LEP), have been reclassified as fluent English proficient (FEP) by the time they graduate from high school. However, these students may still lack sufficient academic English to succeed at the college level and still have ESL features in their writing (see Scarcella, this volume). Therefore, they may be advised or required to enroll in ESL classes. After completing an ESL program and subsequent native speaker English classes through English 1A at the community college, a student may enroll in a CSU and again be advised to take ESL classes in preparation for the GWAR.

Another group of students who may undergo reclassification are the English-dominant bilingual students. These students have much in common with native speakers of English: They have lived in the U.S. for most of their lives, had most of their education in American schools, have oral fluency in English, and use English much of the time. Yet, like ESL students, these students often need instruction in academic literacy and have features in their writing such as dropped inflectional endings, preposition errors, and word choice problems. Although these students are often rightly

placed in classes with native speakers, their needs may be best understood by teachers with training in L2 acquisition and linguistics. Often neither these students nor their advisors and instructors have a clear idea of where they will best be served. Most begin in classes for native speakers (NSs), since they usually do not regard themselves as ESL; but they may later move to ESL classes because teachers of native speakers are unsure how to deal with the residual ESL features in their writing or because they have problems with institutionally administered timed writing exams, where less accommodation may be made for them than in course-related writing.

Expectations for English Development in the CCC and CSU

Contributing to the problem of producing academically literate L2 students is the common misconception of how long it takes to acquire English. Immigrants may need only two or three years to become proficient in social uses of English, but academic proficiency takes much longer. A large-scale study of high school students has shown that the most advantaged L2 students require five to seven years to reach the 50th normal curve equivalent (NCE) on standardized tests such as the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) when they are in the best instructional programs; those with no schooling in their L1 on the average take 7 to 10 years to reach parity with their NS peers (Collier, 1989).

Collier's study has many implications for L2 students in community colleges and CSUs. Unlike the students in the study, many L2 students in California colleges and universities come from working class immigrant families and may not be literate in their first language. In addition, many schools have been overwhelmed by the recent influx of immigrant students—nearly one in four California students, more than 1.25 million, is designated LEP (Maganini, 1995)—and many others, though not officially LEP, still are strongly affected by their L1. These students are often surrounded by peers who are English learners themselves, so they acquire a nonstandard form of English, what has been called ESL as an L2 (Marshall, 1995; see Scarcella, this volume), rather than standard English. Finally, the standard used to measure parity in the Collier (1989) study is a high school standard; the standard for college or university level work is higher and, therefore, will likely take even longer to achieve. Academic proficiency is a moving target since the demands are progressively higher at each level (Marshall, personal communication, 1995). Thus, few L2 students in the California community colleges and CSUs will achieve anything close to educated native-speaker proficiency in reading and writing before finishing their lower division work or even before graduating from a four-year university.

Despite the research that confirms the lengthy process required for L2 students to acquire English, most faculty and others who work with L2 students assume that when students have finished ESL coursework, they will be virtually indistinguishable from their native-speaking peers. At the point at which they are mainstreamed into English courses for native speakers, however, their teachers are often perplexed about what to do with them since their ability to generate and organize ideas, to incorporate the text of others in their writing, and to control grammar and semantics all differ from their classmates' abilities in significant ways (Silva, 1993).

Teachers of content courses are also often puzzled by L2 students in their classes. L2 students in both the community colleges and CSU typically do not wait to finish ESL or developmental English courses before enrolling in general education courses; instead, the assumption is that they can and must take GE courses and even courses in their major while they are completing their ESL or developmental English coursework. Once students begin their studies, financial aid requirements pressure them to take courses for which they may not have the language skills; moreover, the instructors of these courses typically consider language instruction to be outside their responsibility and expertise.

L2 students are sometimes unsuccessful in courses for which they lack adequate English skills, but all too often they are successful when they should not be. Faculty, confronted with a large group of L2 students who cannot write at a college level, may eliminate writing and resort to multiple choice tests. If writing is required, they may encourage students, either overtly or more subtly, to get "help" by having someone else edit their writing or even do it for them. Counselors may contribute to the problem by underestimating the language demands of courses and encouraging students to take courses that should wait until their language skills are stronger.

Implications of the Lack of Consistency Between the CCC and the CSU

The current system of laissez-faire, whereby every institution determines its own standards, results, not surprisingly, in a lack of equivalence both within and across the community college and CSU systems. An L2 student graduating from one community college or CSU may have an entirely different level of English proficiency than a student graduating from another or even the same institution. It is not safe to make generalizations about students' proficiency levels based on the fact that they have satisfactorily completed the transfer composition course in a California community college; and it is only slightly safer to make this generalization for a student completing freshman composition in a CSU. Data collected at one

CSU campus where all incoming L2 students from freshman through graduate levels are tested suggests that upper division students, most of whom transfer from California community colleges, are better prepared than entering lower division students, most of whom come from California high schools. However, completion of freshman composition or the ESL equivalent at either a community college or CSU does not ensure that students will be prepared for university level work, according to that campus's definition (see Table 2). This lack of preparation is of more than theoretical interest since these underprepared upper division ESL students will need to demonstrate writing proficiency in order to satisfy the Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR).

Table 2
ESL Student Placement, Fall 1995

Level	*Freshmen*	*n*	*Transfers*	*n*
College level (advanced ESL)	5%	.6	9%	.12
One semester below (high intermediate)	31%	.36	43%	.59
Two semesters below (intermediate)	58%	.67	46%	.63
Three semesters below (high beginning)	5%	.6	2%	.3

Note: The data in Table 2 are from the English Diagnostic Test Report, CSU, Sacramento, (fall, 1995). Freshmen students come primarily from California high schools; transfer students come mostly from California community colleges (see Appendix C for sample essays at each level).

Calls for Improved Articulation

At this time neither the community colleges nor the CSU has attempted to document success rates of L2 students. Most research has instead focused on success rates based on ethnicity, which often does not correspond to the L1. Administrators in the California community colleges chancellor's office and the California Department of Education, who were contacted for information about studies on ESL student success, agreed that such studies would be beneficial. One of the recommendations of the CSU Workgroup on Underprepared Students (endorsed by the CSU trustees' Committee on Educational Policy, 1996, in its final report on remediation entitled *Precollegiate Skills Instruction*) is that "CSU campuses should identify prior to placement in CSU English courses those students whose first language is not English and whose major skill needs are developmental in nature." (Attachment A.; see also Asian Pacific American Advisory Committee, 1994, p. 10; and California State University, Office of the Chancellor, 1988, p. 8) If this policy is implemented, it will mean that for the first time L2 students will be identified and data can be collected to document their progress through the university.

Ideally, community college standards for freshman composition or its ESL equivalent would be consistent and would mesh with the standards in the 23 CSUs. However, in the CSUs no attempts have been made to articulate those criteria with the community colleges except through a few localized efforts, which have been limited by lack of ongoing funding (see Ediger, Flachmann & Pluta, and Murray, this volume). It is not uncommon for students to place two semesters below freshman English on the English Placement Test yet be able to go directly into freshman English on a community college campus. The CSU trustees have recently indicated a greater commitment to resolving such differences. They state that their recommendations in *Precollegiate Skills Instruction* "represent a commitment to working with our partners in elementary and secondary education and with the California Community Colleges and other segments of higher education in an all-out effort to strengthen education by creating an interconnected framework of common and well understood goals, expectations, and standards" (California State University, Committee on Educational Policy, 1996, p. 5).

Recommendations for Achieving More Consistent Standards

Although the CSU trustees' original proposal in fall 1995 to end remediation in the CSU seemed to be closing the doors of the four-year university system to many second language students, the final policy (California State University, Committee on Educational Policy, 1996) is a strong call for better communication among the segments of California education. Communication and subsequent collaboration can remedy the situation that now exists wherein the community colleges and CSU, as systems, campuses, and programs, function independently of one another.

A variety of groups have addressed the lack of adequate articulation among segments and its effects on ESL students. A report to the Intersegmental Coordinating Council (Intersegmental Coordinating

Council, Curriculum and Assessment Cluster Committee, 1989)) noted a lack of intersegmental competency standards and recommended the development of a statement of language competencies and performance levels for NNSs of English and the articulation of ESL tests. Likewise, in October 1991 the ESL Conference on Building Better Bridges for ESL Students addressed curriculum standards, matriculation, and assessment of ESL students across the community college, CSU and University of California systems. The common outcome, however, has been a lack of ongoing funding to implement the generally sound recommendations which these groups have repeatedly made. Some local projects have been funded with short term grants while other efforts have been carried out without funding, simply through the goodwill of the instructors on the various campuses. The recognition that the preparation of second language students must be an intersegmental effort needs to be accompanied by ongoing intersegmental support. Without that support the needed communication between segments simply will not happen.

Improved communication will ensure that everyone involved with L2 instruction has a clear idea of the standards expected for college-level work. Outreach by college ESL instructors, perhaps in the form of joint in-service discussions between high school, community college, and CSU faculty, could lead to a clearer understanding of the need for student preparation and possibly to the establishment of more academic ESL courses in the high schools. Better articulation between the community colleges and the CSU is also needed. Possible ways to achieve this might include joint curriculum development, shared assignments leading to joint grading sessions, and the inclusion of community college instructors in EPT and GWAR assessment. Innovative programs modeled on the Bay Area Writing Project could help bring theory and practice together and result in substantive changes in curriculum at all levels. An intersegmental perspective could encourage counselors and other student service personnel to recognize the role of ESL instruction in their students' overall progression from the CCC to the CSU.

Adequate funding is also needed so that assessment can become an intersegmental effort. The development of a set of descriptors to describe the language proficiencies of L2 students across high school, community colleges, CSUs and UCs (see Browning, this volume) is an important beginning. However, funding must be found so that the descriptors can be validated, attached to language samples, and used to develop intersegmental assessment tools. Common measurements and common language to describe the outcome of the measurements will go a long way toward ensuring that students are prepared at one level to move on to the next and that

expectations for language development at each level are realistic given what is known about second language acquisition. A final step is to provide funding to collect data and develop intersegmental tools so that the data are comparable.

The lack of coherence of curriculum and standards between the community colleges and the CSU that currently exists is misleading to students and results in wasteful duplication of effort. The task of educating our second language students is so important, long, and labor-intensive, that we can no longer afford that wastefulness. Articulation, in the sense of both communication and collaboration, is essential at this time in California's educational history. ■

Endnotes

1. Students' rank is based on a combination of their high school grade point average and their scores on either the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or the American College Test (ACT).

2. This article uses the term developmental to refer to precollege-level ESL courses even though the CSU system categorizes these courses as remedial. See the (1994) *CATESOL Position Statement on the Differences Between English as a Second Language and Basic Skills Instruction at Postsecondary Levels.*. (Available from CATESOL, 1146 N. Central Avenue, #195, Glendale, CA 91202.)

References

Asian Pacific American Education Advisory Committee. (1994, August). *Asian Pacific Americans in the CSU: A follow-up report.* Long Beach, CA: California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

California community colleges, Chancellor's Office. (1990). *ESL placement tests for Community Colleges: A user's guide.* (Report No. 875). Sacramento: Author.

California Community Colleges, Chancellor's Office. (1995). *Standards, policies and procedures for the evaluation of assement instruments.* Sacramento: Author.

California State University, Committee on Education Policy. (1992). *CSU efforts to support the needs of language minority students.* Sacramento: California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

California State University, Committee on Education Policy. (1996, January 23–24). *Precollegiate skills instruction.* (Agenda Item 2). Long Beach: California State University, Office of the Chancellor.

California State Univesity, Office of the Chancellor. (1988). *Report of the English as a Second Language workgroup.* Long Beach: Author.

California State University, Sacramento, English Department. (1995, Fall). *English diagnostic test report.* (unpublished).

Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*, 509-531.

Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education. (1987). *The master plan renewed: Unity, equity, quality, and efficiency in California postsecondary education.* Sacramento: State of California.

Intersegmental Coordinating Council, Curriculum and Assessment Cluster Committee. (1989, September). *California's limited English language students: An intersegmental agenda.* (Revised). Sacramento: Author.

Maganini, S. (1995, December 3). Education: 20,000 more bilingual teachers needed. *Sacramento Bee,* p. 12.

Marshall, F. (1995, April). *ESL as a second language.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the California Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.

Richardson, J. (1995, September 29). CSU trustee: End remedial programs. *Sacramento Bee,* pp. 1, 30.

Sacramento City College, English Department. *ESL 5 course description.* (1995). Sacramento: Author.

Silva, T. (1933). Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications. *TESOL Quarterly, 27* (4), 657-677.

State of California. Department of General Services. Office of Administrative Hearings. (1993). *California Administrative Code, Title 5, Education.* Sacramento: Author.

Appendix A

Questionnaire
GWAR for ESL Students in the CSU

1. Name and address of school:

2. Person responding to questionnaire:

   Position: E-mail:

   Phone: Fax:

---

1. How is the GWAR fulfilled on your campus?
   test: _____ test to place into course: _____
   course: _____ course followed by test: _____

2. Which of your requirements may be repeated? How many times?

3. What are the provisions for counseling?

4. What are the provisions for appeals?

5. Are ESL students identified on your campus? If so, how?

6. How do ESL students on your campus satisfy the GWAR? Is there any difference from requirements for native speakers? Please describe.

7. If students on your campus take courses to prepare for the GWAR, please answer the following questions:

   How many courses are required? How many units are they?

   What are the department and the hegis code of the courses?

8. If students on your campus take courses to satisfy the GWAR, please answer the following questions:

   How many courses are required? How many units are they?

   What are the department and the hegis code of the courses?

9. Is the GWAR a barrier to graduation for many of your ESL students? Do ESL students have to repeat the test or course (indicate which) more times than native speakers?

10. Do you keep statistics on the pass rate for ESL students vs. native speakers? If so, please include recent information.

11. Is there a difference in the success rates on the GWAR of ESL community college transfer students compared with ESL students who began as freshmen on your campus?

12. Are there problems with articulation of standards for ESL students between the community colleges and your campus?

Appendix B
ESL Student Graduation Writing Requirements at CSU Campuses

California State University Campus	*How GWAR Is Fulfilled*	*GWAR Accommodations for ESL Students*
Bakersfield	Exam and course	None
Chico	Exam and course	ESL tests read by trained ESL faculty
Dominguez Hills	Exam and course	Extra time
Fresno	Exam or course	None
Fullerton	Exam, course option after 2 failures	None
Hayward	Exam	None
Humboldt	Exam	Lower score for visa students returning to home country
Long Beach	Exam	None
Los Angeles	Exam, course option after 1 failure	Double time, read by selected readers
Maritime	Exam and course	None
Monterey	Data not available	
Northridge	Exam	Read separately by trained ESL readers
Pomona	Exam	None
Sacramento	Exam	Extra time, read by trained ESL readers
San Bernardino	Course	None
San Diego	Exam or course	Special course for L2
San Francisco	Exam	Special course for L2
San Jose	Exam	None
San Luis Obispo	Exam or course	Extra time, read by trained ESL readers
San Marcos	GWAR satisfied by upper division course	None
Sonoma	Exam	None
Stanislaus	Course	None

Appendix C
Sample Student Placement Essays

College Level (Advanced ESL)

There is no question about the fact that honesty and loyalty are good qualities to have. However, when trying to choose one over the other, people look to themselves and based on their culture, religion, traditions and moral beliefs, arrive at a conclusion that will sound fair and just to them. However their conclusions are a matter of their personal opinions that reflect their cultures and lives.

Honesty isn't always a good approach in particular situations. If we look at the hypothetical example of a three year old girl looking out the window waiting for her dad to come home on a rainy evening. If her dad died in a car accident, how would you be honest to a three year old who doesn't even know the meaning of death?

On the other hand, loyalty isn't always good either. Just look at World War II and at Hitler's army that was loyal to the end only to commit one of the most gruesome acts of geniside in the history of man. The soldiers blind foldedly followed the commands of their leaders and didn't even realize the damage they were doing to themselves and others.

To arrive at my point, I want to say that my cultural and traditional background advocates loyalty in friendship. It is a widely accepted fact in my culture that loyalty in friendship is the most important jewel. In friendship, loyalty comes first, but honesty among friends is also a strong factor. But that doesn't entirely answer my question. The kind of problems and the kind of circumstances that might surround a situation must be the final factor to be taken into account when making a judgment.

One Semester Below College Level (High Intermediate ESL)

Honesty Vs. Loyalty

"Honesty is the best policy," when I am searching for a true friend, honesty would be the first characteric I look for. By this reason, I believe honesty is more important in a friendship, honesty can also serve as part of loyalty.

I am a person, who regard friendship highly, so therefore honesty had serve as an guiding light toward many of my decesions, when it came to choosing between the right and wrong doing of my friend. An example of my decesion between loyalty and honesty was demonstrated in my junior year. One of my close friend cheated on the midterm. At the beginning, I acted as nothing had happen, but as time goes by, I need to speak to some-

one in order to retrieve harmony. I spoke to another close friendship, but she doesn't see my point or concern. At the end, I spoke to the friend that had cheated on the midterm, she expressed regret. So we both went and told the teacher. By this experience, our friendship had reach a higher understanding. Upon a conversation, she had told me that she was glad, that I told her about how I felt about dishonest people. Honesty had not only serve as a steping stone to our friendship but also as a tool to loyalty. By being honest about how I felt, I had done my duty as a friend and that meant loyalty to me. Till today, I still believe that honesty is the best policy.

Two Semesters Below College Level (Intermediate ESL)

Being honesty and loyalty is very difficult when someone find out his or her best friend cheating in school. In the view of loyalty to friends, people should be in their friends' side and protect their friends from hurt. Also, the definition of friend is caring, sharing, and protecting each other. Moreover, the most important point for being friends is honesty. Honesty is the significant requirement for true friendship. When someone finds out his or her friend was cheating in school, he or she should not act like see no evil, hear no evil. If the person doing so, he or she is not a good friend for that cheating person. The person should tell his or her friend (cheating one) what he or she did in school is wrong. Also, the friend of the cheating person should be a honesty studend too. He or she should tell the true to their teacher after he or she gives a lesson to the cheating one.

Loyalty to friends should be wisely, honestly, and legally. They should not let their friend falling into unethic matters or actions. If a good friend do nothing when he or she knows his or her friend cheating in school, he or she act like an devil evil who pulls his or her friend out of the cliff. The cheating person will never find out the true friendship is and he or she never knows what his or her fault is.

Three Semesters Below College Level (High Beginning ESL)

I will be surprised because I know my friend very will, and we talk about all the time is school to have good knowldge and understanding very well what we take the class. Not only pass the class with out understanding the material what we learn. Because of this I know her. But if she is cheating I will be disoppaited. But I will take her that she is not wright what she is doing. Cheating is gambling and distroyed people life.