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Introduction
On May 9, 2016, the Writing Program submitted the “Preliminary Assessment of UCSC’s Multilingual Curriculum for International Students.” Though CEP Chair Tamkun reported that the multilingual curriculum (MLC) has a “very positive impact on international students who fail to satisfy ELWR before entering UCSC,” CEP and CPB rightly requested to see updated data for the full pilot academic-year. These data—plus Writing 1 data—are provided below. Writing 1 data are included as students in those classes are MLC matriculates; thus, their pass rates reflect MLC efficacy. In short, the Writing Program designed the MLC to expedite ELWR satisfaction and prepare students for Writing 1 (C1). Additionally, the MLC also strives to prepare students for Writing 2 (C2) through its focus on primary research.

Reviewing Spring ELWR satisfaction percentages and MLC and Writing 1 course pass rates, the MLC continues to show, on the whole, that the curriculum successfully prepares students for the demands of college writing. The tables below provide pass rates for the 2015-16 academic year.

ELWR Satisfaction
Spring numbers show an even greater percentage of students satisfying ELWR via the MLC (84.6%) than in previous quarters (see Table 1 or 2). Similar to fall and winter quarters, MLC students satisfied ELWR at a higher overall percentage than peers placed in ELWR-required Core and the subsequent Writing 20 series (Writing 20 and Writing 21). We feel that these data are especially compelling in light of the fact that students enrolled in the MLC earned composite scores of 2-5 on

---

1 ELWR = Entry Level Writing Requirement
2 International students at Crown who earned 6s were placed into fall sections of WRIT 20. In winter quarter, they proceeded to the appropriate Core course: ELWR-required Core for those who remain ELWR-required or ELWR-satisfied Core for those who were newly ELWR-satisfied.
3 Students’ performance in Writing 23, the 4th-quarter fall course for ELWR-required students, cannot be reported on until the end of this quarter.
the Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE), while those who were mainstreamed in ELWR-required Core and the Writing 20 series earned 6s.

At the end of spring quarter 2016, MLC faculty, including Writing Program Chair Heather Shearer and Entry Level Writing Coordinator Sarah-Hope Parmeter, met to further norm MLC faculty to ELWR criteria to ensure greater rater reliability and accuracy in the assessment of student portfolios produced in Writing 27. Reliability is critical as Writing 27 students satisfy ELWR through completing coursework and preparing a writing portfolio for instructor review.

Table 1: MLC/ELWR-Required Course Comparison for ELWR-Required F1-Visa Students
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELWR-Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELWR-required (non-MLC)</td>
<td>15.8% (6/38)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 27 (MLC)</td>
<td>71.1% (32/45)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Winter Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELWR-required (non-MLC)</td>
<td>29.0% (9/31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 27 (MLC)</td>
<td>73.5% (50/68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Quarter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 21</td>
<td>50.0% (12/24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 27 (MLC)</td>
<td>84.6% (44/52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data gathered from ELWR portfolio pass rates as reported by WP's ELWR Coordinator; “All Who Need ELWR” report in InfoView; and information provided by the International Education Office.
- Included in “ELWR-required (non-MLC) totals throughout this table are students enrolled in non-MLC classes that submitted ELWR portfolios for review. A small number of F1 students are as a consequence unaccounted for in this table (i.e., those who did not submit a portfolio for review).
- * By and large, the students enrolled in Core 80A earned composite scores of 6 on the AWPE. The exception is Cowell College, which required 80A Core of all MLC students, regardless of proficiency level. These students proceeded to Writing 20 in winter if they failed to satisfy ELWR via 80A Core. Additionally, students in WRIT 20 and 21 received peer tutoring; students in the MLC did not.
- ** Students in fall sections of WRIT 27 earned a composite score of 5 on the AWPE.
MLC and Writing 1 Course Pass Rates

Spring quarter Writing 27 students had the highest course pass rate percentage (84.6%) compared to fall (71.1%) and winter (73.5%) quarters (see Table 1 or 2). Spring Writing 27 students primarily represent students who have successfully taken Writing 25 and Writing 26; it thus appears that the curriculum successfully works to prepare students to satisfy ELWR, a measure of college-writing preparedness.

Validating this premise, Writing 1(C1) students did well both winter and spring quarters. Indeed, 88.5% (23/26) of students passed Writing 1 in winter (see Table 2), and 100% passed in spring (52/52 students). The majority of spring Writing 1 students began their studies in Writing 26 and satisfied ELWR in Writing 27, again showing program effectiveness. Further, the faculty who taught Writing 1 in 2015-16 were seasoned composition teachers, but none had extensive formal training in working with multilingual learners. That these teachers were able to work with international students with relative facility reflects positively on MLC efficacy. Additionally, because of the faculty’s extensive WP experience, we feel confident in claiming that students earned their passing grades without grade inflation. In short, the MLC prepares students for C1 demands.

The single downward trend among all courses occurred in spring’s Writing 26. Here, 80% passed the course compared to 97.1% in winter and 96.9% in fall. Without further analysis, it is uncertain what produced this dip. However, Writing 25 teachers, the course from which students came, remarked that students were relatively weak compared to other cohorts. Therefore, it is possible that Writing 25 teachers may have subconsciously showed leniency to these students as no Writing 25 class was offered spring quarter—the rationale being that students would do best to fail Writing 26 than have no English-writing class at all. In light of this possible influence, the Writing Program has addressed this with MLC faculty and has taken steps to more quickly identify admitted students who are likely too weak in their English language abilities to proceed through the MLC and meet the campus’ C2 deadline on time. To accomplish the latter, Writing 24 was removed from the curriculum, and those placed in the lowest class (Writing 25) must be “up or out” by the end of Winter 2017.

---

4 It did help that each section enrolled fewer students than is typical, but these numbers were in line with national recommendations about class size for courses enrolling multilingual learners (~15 per section). This will not be the case moving forward. Class size recommendations come from the Conference on College Composition and Communication Statement on Second Language Writing and Writers, updated November 2014: “Since working with second language writers often requires additional feedback and conference time with the instructor, enrollments in mainstream classes with a substantial number of second language writers should be reduced to a maximum of 20 students per class. In classes made up exclusively of second language writers, enrollments should be limited to a maximum of 15 students per class.”
### Table 2: MLC Pass Rates for AY 2015-16 Frosh Cohort
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>% Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 26</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIT 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data gathered through “Student Grades and GPA in Subjects or Courses” report in InfoView.

### MLC Future Directions

As we have just completed our pilot year, the WP will continue to monitor, assess, and improve the curriculum. To this end, we have prioritized the following projects and goals for the 2016-17 academic year.

#### Placement:
- Continue to assess the AWPE's reliability and validity for placing students into Writing 25-27.
- Create mechanisms for identifying and placing ELWR-required non-F1 visa immigrant students into the MLC.
- Design a process for “re-placing” MLC students who would be better served in different MLC course levels (e.g., in the first week of classes, moving a WRIT 26 student to WRIT 27 or vice versa).

#### Assessment:
- Continue to norm portfolio assessment to ensure reliable scoring across the curriculum as well as provide positive washback for students enrolled in WRIT 25 and WRIT 26.
- Track Writing 2 MLC matriculates.

#### Qualitative Analysis of Teacher Experience:
- Redistribute online teacher experience surveys for greater response rate. In spring, we distributed distinct surveys to four instructor populations who worked with MLC students.
- Code survey data for thematic findings.

#### Course Design:
- Refine curricula and common assessment criteria based on assessments already conducted.
• Assess efficacy of tutor training for those working with students in the MLC. 2016-17 marks the first academic year that students in the MLC will be provided with peer tutoring. Peer tutoring is a regular feature of ELWR-required sections of Core, Writing 20, Writing 21, and Writing 23.

Communication across Campus Units:
• Continue to reach out across campus units (e.g., LAAL, IEO, CoP, advising) so that we can better serve students socially and academically.

Program Costs & Decanal Support
The Writing Program is working with the Division of Humanities to determine the real costs of the MLC. At root is this question: is the MLC more expensive, less expensive, or similarly expensive to putting students through the usual course sequence (i.e., 80A Core, followed the Writing 20 sequence for domestic students)? This budgetary assessment has been taking place alongside a larger divisional and campus conversation about the funding of all writing classes that help students meet UC requirements (ELWR) and campus requirements (C1/C2). We should have concrete information to report in December when our Curriculum and Leave plan is submitted to the Division of Humanities for review and approval. If CEP desires, a written statement detailing commitment to these ongoing budgetary conversations, documentation can be provided.