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Abstract

The number of documented immigrant students at Minnesota State University in Mankato, Minnesota (MSU) for whom English is not their first language is growing. This growth has challenged the institution to make programmatic changes as it supports the learning needs of this expanding student population. The Language Learning for Academic Success Program (LLAS) is one way in which the institution is meeting these needs. Launched in 2004, the program’s goal is to facilitate students’ development for college level reading, writing and critical inquiry. The thesis will begin to answer the following question by looking at a variety of data: Is the LLAS program, as it currently operates, meeting the needs of the immigrant students at MSU?

The preliminary data is positive. The students enrolling in the LLAS program are doing well academically. The LLAS students have higher GPA rankings compared to other first year MSU students. Although it remains a challenge to find the immigrant students who may benefit from the program, the data does show that once an immigrant student is identified, having a range of assessment indicators to validate his or her enrollment into the LLAS program is effective.
Chapter 1

Introduction

The growing number of immigrants into the United States in recent years has been changing the demographics of large cities and small communities alike. Newer immigrants are finding their way to universities and colleges across the country. These students arrive at post secondary institutions with unique and varied life and educational experiences. Some of these students have been in the US for extended periods of time (10 years or more) studying and using academic English in US schools. Typically, this group of immigrant students is able to negotiate the new linguistic and cultural demands they meet at post secondary institutions successfully. However, other immigrant students have been here for shorter periods of time (less than 10 years) and may or may not have any educational experiences in US schools. This group finds it daunting to make the linguistic and cultural leaps necessary to be successful at post secondary institutions.

Minnesota State University (MSU) in Mankato, Minnesota has seen the rate of documented immigrant students increase significantly over the past 10 years. (Figure 1)
On the Minnesota State University Application for Admission, students are asked the following questions. 1. Citizen of USA? (Y or N). 2. If no, what is your permanent resident card number? If students list a permanent resident card number, they are coded in the system as 03 (indicating resident alien). There is also a question on the application that reads: 3. Is English your native language (Y/N)? That question tends to elicit different and sometimes inaccurate responses. These are the only questions on the application that may help identify a non international student's language background. There are many students at MSU whose first language is not English and who have recently become US citizens. Because they may not identify that English is not their first language, the current application for enrollment and coding system at MSU probably
does not identify a large group of students who could benefit from additional language support as they begin their studies at the university.

In addition to the problem of not accurately identifying English Language Learners upon admission, MSU also does not require any incoming students (who are not international) to take an English assessment and/or placement exam. All students are required to take a math placement exam during orientation, but no students are required to take an English placement exam. MSU does require that students take the ACT exam, but students can still be admitted to the university on the condition they take the ACT exam some time during their first year of enrollment. This challenges faculty and staff as they try to identify English Language Learners and provide appropriate support to them as they begin their studies.

Some of the students who are classified with the admission citizenship codes of 03 (indicating immigrant, refugee or asylum) have the tools needed to succeed at the university. However, there are also students within this classification who struggle with academic language, particularly writing and reading, and also need help acculturating to the new environment. MSU created a program specifically to address the needs of this growing population of students.

The program currently in place is titled the Language Learning for Academic Success (LLAS). The program has a three-part focus: to facilitate student development of college level reading, writing and critical inquiry; to provide time for enhanced language acquisition; and, to help acclimate students to the new academic climate. The LLAS program was initiated with funding form the Minnesota State Colleges and University Underrepresented Student Retention Initiative and it has been in existence for
one year. As stated by Murie (2004) in the first evaluation of the program, "Unlike traditional English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for international students, which focus on pre-college language skills, the goal of an integrated program such as the Language Learning for Academic Success (LLAS) is to build language support and academic acculturation around an entire freshmen curriculum of coursework. This is an approach designed for students graduating from US high schools who have learned English but who benefit from additional academic support as they develop college-level proficiency in reading and writing" (p. 3).

The LLAS program is partly modeled after the Commanding English program at the University of Minnesota. According to the University of Minnesota Commanding English web site, (November 11, 2005) from Commanding English (CE) is a two-semester sequence of courses at the University of Minnesota offered to freshmen for whom English is not the first language. Through a curriculum of credit bearing courses, students work on academic English while taking some of the standard courses (speech, biology, freshman composition, literature, etc.) typical of the freshman year. The program aims high but builds support in the way of reading adjunct courses, small class size, tutors in every writing class, special advising, and a teaching staff that is well-trained and enthusiastic (http://www.gen.umn.edu/programs/ce/about.htm).

The Commanding English program has existed for just over 20 years and compared to the LLAS program has a fairly large staff to student ratio. One significant difference between the Commanding English program and the LLAS program is that the Commanding English program is required based on students test scores. Students who
indicate that English is not their first language are required to submit either TOEFL or ACT English scores. Based on those scores, students are placed into the Commanding English program. The LLAS program is voluntary. Students are recruited based on their ACT test scores and any background information submitted regarding their previous education but, even if they meet the criteria for enrolling in the program, ultimately the students decide if they want/need additional language support as they enter the university.

1.1 LLAS Program Description

Like the Commanding English program, the LLAS program follows a content-based curriculum. Students register for a cohort of courses. The cohort is meant to provide challenging content that allows the students occasions to practice reading, writing and research inquiry skills. All of the coursework is credit bearing and counts toward a degree at MSU. In the fall of 2004, the students registered for the following courses; ESL 210 (the content based ESL support course), Ethnic Studies 100 (a general education requirement at MSU), English 100 (a pre-requisite to English 101) or English 101 (the required freshmen composition course at MSU), First Year Experience (a one credit course introducing students to college in general). In addition, some students elected to take a Math course. The students who remained in or joined the program spring 2005 semester registered for the following courses; ESL 210, English 101 (if not already completed), Chemistry 104 or Biology 100, and Speech 100 (a required general education course). Again, some students also elected to take Math.

The faculty and instructors who teach the courses collaborate to facilitate the student learning. As with any new program, there were challenges with this collaboration during the first year, but it continues to be a central focus of development. In the fall of
2004, the faculty member from Ethnic studies provided information on the kind of tests the students would be taking and what materials they would study over the semester. As the instructor for the ESL 210 course, I focused the language lessons on much of the material from ethnic studies and because the students were taking mostly multiple choice tests, I also worked on multiple choice test taking strategies. In the spring of 2005, all the students who enrolled in Biology and Chemistry were assigned tutors. The tutors worked with them for one hour each week on the content of their Biology and Chemistry lessons. The tutors attended the classes with the students so they could compare class notes and disseminate class lectures together. Students who elected to take Math classes formed study groups and also worked with tutors in the Math department. All of these strategies were meant to support the content of their course work while making sure they were also focused on academic language learning. Contextualizing this learning is the goal of the LLAS program. By utilizing the content of the other coursework, the ESL 210 course proved more meaningful and relevant to the language learning the students engaged in.

1.2 The ESL 210 Course

A major component of the LLAS program is the ESL 210 course. Although students work on language development in all of their courses, this class targets specific language skills. Through interviews and in class writing assessments, it was clear that one of the greatest challenges for the students as they began their studies at MSU was academic writing. Most of the students were very comfortable with spoken English. They were comfortable discussing the materials from Ethnic Studies, sharing opinions, and talking about what they were reading in other classes. However, writing an academic
essay was challenging for them. A great deal of time in both the fall and spring semesters was spent teaching the students how to write an academic essay.

The book, The Write Start, was based on as a model for teaching academic writing. In this writing text book, the authors work on developing the five paragraph essay. This approach is somewhat formulaic but it provides a template that this group of ESL learners found reassuring. In the ESL 210 class, this approach allowed students a formula that appeared to help them with organization and development in their writing.

In addition to utilizing the five paragraph essay, the students were asked to keep a grammar and vocabulary journal. This was one way to get them to notice their own grammar errors as well as help them self direct their vocabulary learning. This pedagogical strategy was meant to promote autonomous grammar and vocabulary learning. The intention of this assignment was to help the students become aware of their grammatical errors and how to acquire more vocabulary while in the LLAS program, but also to encourage this learning long term. The hope is that they will continue to use the strategies for learning grammar and acquiring new vocabulary throughout their academic career.

Finally, part of the year was devoted to academic reading. The students read a relatively easy novel titled Of Beetles and Angels. They also read a number of essays from American Voices and Dream me Home Safely. I utilized these shorter readings to focus more specifically on academic reading strategies like critical reading, summary reading and learning new vocabulary terms based on content. The readings also supported the content of the Ethnic Studies course the students took in the first semester.
1.3 Evaluation Report

In March of 2005, Robin Murie, Director of the Commanding English program at the University of Minnesota, submitted an evaluation of the first semester of the LLAS program. Murie (2005) writes, “Evaluation of LLAS was based on two site visits, ongoing communication with the program coordinator, data gathered from students filling out questionnaires, and samples of student writing and course assignments” (p. 4). The evaluation is an extensive document and the contents certainly help answer the question: Is the LLAS program, as it currently operates, meeting the need of the students?

Though the evaluation is based only on the first semester of the program, its contents continue to guide the development and growth of the program. Thus elements of the evaluation are included here. Probably the most insightful information contained in the evaluation is the information provided by the students themselves. This thesis will not include all of the useful information from the evaluation, focusing instead on two important parts: 1) Feedback given on the LLAS Student Evaluation administered on 12/07/04. Murie (2005) writes, “At the end of the first semester, students were asked to give feedback on aspects of their first semester experience in LLAS. There were 10 open ended questions eliciting what has been most/least useful about the program, what suggestions for improvement, etc. and 14 statements about aspects of the program to rank” (p. 5). The more revealing questions and responses will be included here. 2) Student Feedback gathered on 11/16/04 site visit. Again, Murie writes, “This feedback form asked students to rate the helpfulness of various components of LLAS, to write
what they felt they were learning in their 4 courses, and to offer suggestions about improving the program. There were 22 respondents” (p. 5).

1.4 LLAS Student Evaluation

The following two questions (Question 3 and Question 4) are part of the 12/07/04 Student Evaluation conducted by Robin Murie. Murie asked some open ended questions of the students in an informal setting. They were in a classroom and asked to voluntarily respond to a number of questions. Question 3 and 4 reveal some of the more interesting opinions the students in the program had about its usefulness.

Question 3: What has been most helpful/useful to you about the LLAS program?

- All in all it was useful- it helps me a lot. I learn how to write an essay some grammar, and so on.
- I learn about the career center, the academic center, and other stuff that all the freshmen should know.
- Don’t really know.
- Sorry nothing.
- Tense grammar was the most helpful.
- Grammar and the journal entries.
- I get all the tutoring help that I need and I also learn a lot in class.
- None.
- Maybe to me, it didn’t help me much but to other student it might be useful.
- Writing, grammar, maybe some friends.
- I would say the writings.
- Studying as a groups and doing things together.
- An excellent teaching by the instructor. Grammar, vocabulary and sentence structure.
- Grammar
- The most helpful for me was the writing skill.
- LLAS is very helpful program for me as a foreing student. I got help in writing, typing and every time I need help, tutors are willing to help me.
- Writing journals and grammar work.

Question 4: What has been least helpful/useful to you about the LLAS program?

- There is no enough grammar practice.
• Don’t really do any English learning, except writing papers and do grammar.
• Don’t really know.
• Anything me learning.
• Doing the journals.
• Reviewing for the Ethnic study test.
• I feel that because I took this program I am behind in my credits that I have to be taking.
• None.
• Not doing what I expected.
• We did not get enough vocab words.
• I would say the studying for test.
• None.
• I have never identified any least helpful on the program.
• In my opinion, all that I learned is helpful/useful.
• All the sections are good.
• Journal writing.

These questions and responses reveal there is room for improvement in curriculum development even as some needs are being addressed. Most of the students stated they would recommend the LLAS program to future students.

1.5 Student Feedback

Similar to the Student Evaluation the following question and responses elicited helpful responses and advice for future LLAS programming. This question was asked on a written survey that was given to the students on 11/16/04. It directly asks the students to reflect upon what they felt was the most helpful about the LLAS program. This feedback is critical for program evaluation.

Question 2: What has been most helpful to you so far about the LLAS program?

• In this class I learned about my experience as to college students.
• ESL 210.
• Grammar rules/vocabulary/sentences in correct order.
• It helps me to write and also helps me for another class.
• There were two particular class I liked but taking all of my time.
• Groups sharing and communication.
• I don't think it has really been helpful for me, because I think that I would be better off w/out the program and taking classes that I really need. I also feel behind.
• Schooling advantage.
• Nothing at all.
• Show direct me to the writing tutor.
• Some support to work out your problems and situations.
• How to write a summary.
• It is helpful because I learnt how to communicate with students and working with group.
• I would say the writing skills.
• Grammar, studying for ethnic studies.
• I don't really know, I haven't seen anything as a big help.
• LLAS is a good start for me as a freshman. Everything will become easy thereafter. I feel self-confident in myself.
• I feel connected to MSU.
• The LLAS do help me in a way, but in some way it make me fall behind on my major class because of this program. I don't think there should be this program should go on anymore. LLAS should give to student who is undeclared so they won't fall behind on their major like people who have major.

These responses are helpful when thinking about how to direct curriculum and programming for future LLAS program students.

Murie's evaluation offered two important recommendations: current strengths of the program as well as challenges the program needs to address. The data gathered and evaluated for the purposes of revealing the strengths and the challenges are extensive so this thesis will summarize those findings.

Murie states, "Three important strengths stand out immediately in the data: Retention, Sense of cohort and support, and Flexibility in Constructing the LLAS Curriculum" (p. 11). Regarding the challenges, Murie writes, "Any program in its first semester of operation can expect to find areas that need fine-tuning. Three challenges stood out in the first semester of LLAS: 1. recruitment and assessment, 2. academic
expectations and rigor, and 3. how best to serve the needs of the “long timers” in the group, the students who have been in U.S. schools most of their lives. All of these challenges are well within the range of things that can be adjusted in a program that is basically sound” (p. 13). What this reveals is that the program is addressing the needs of the students but also requires further growth. The evaluation as a whole is insightful because it helps identify the strengths of the program but also reveals the areas that are not yet meeting the needs of the students.

Murie’s document is one that should be revisited often as the program asks whether or not it is meeting the needs of the students. The data collected and analyzed could be replicated for future years as the questions of 1) how to identify students and 2) what kind of curriculum best addresses their academic English learning needs are addressed.

1.6 Research Question

As a new and emerging program, LLAS will continue to grow, change and explore in order to ensure it is meeting the needs of the students. As the program continues to develop, one overriding question needs attention:

Is the LLAS program, as it is currently set up, meeting the needs of the immigrant students at MSU?

This thesis will answer that question by looking at a variety of data. One major area that must be explored is whether or not MSU is appropriately identifying the students who would benefit from the LLAS program. In the fall of 2004, most of the students recruited for the program had been in the US for less than 10 years with ACT English scores of 18 or below (in some cases the students didn’t have ACT scores and that group
was also recruited based mostly on their number of years in the US). If students met one or both of those criteria, they were encouraged to enroll in the program. Though the ACT English scores and the number of years in the US were primary indicators helping to identify students, additional factors were also utilized. Those factors included high school rankings, individual interviews with students, a voluntary questionnaire and a timed essay. Collectively, these indicators were used to find students who would benefit from the LLAS program. The admissions records and assessment indicators of three students admitted to MSU and who voluntarily enrolled in the LLAS program in the fall of 2004 will be reviewed, helping determine if placement into the program was appropriate. These case studies will show the profiles of the students upon admission that includes the following: admissions coding, the student’s ACT English scores, and number of years in the US. This case study will also include reflections of the conversations/interviews the coordinator of the program had with these students during summer orientation and a voluntary questionnaire the students filled out asking about their academic literacy. Additionally, the case studies will review a timed essay the students wrote during the first week of enrollment in the LLAS program. This analysis should provide insight as to student’s level of academic literacy. Such data will help provide information about the kind of assessment tools that could be used to identify students for the program.

Additional data to answer the question of how well the program is succeeding as it currently operates will be explored by looking at all of the students who enrolled in the LLAS program during the academic year 2004-2005 compared to students of similar demographic backgrounds who opted not to enroll in the program. This includes their
GPA ranking after each semester, their grades in the courses that the program was meant to support and their retention at MSU.

The question of whether or not the program is meeting the needs of the students as it is currently set up is complicated. The data for students who enrolled in the program vs. students who opted not to enroll in the program, as well as the case studies being reviewed offer insight as to the effectiveness of the program. It is premature to make any final conclusions regarding whether or not the program is meeting the needs of the students. However, this thesis can begin to answer the question by looking at available data and making some initial recommendations about the program as it currently operates.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

The literature review addresses two major areas of significance: assessment and programming. It is necessary to examine assessment theories because a major success of the program lies with finding as well as appropriately placing students into the program. On-going assessment practices for the program also require continued discussion. Because the range of academic backgrounds for this cohort of students is broad, an additional examination of texts and articles helping define this group is included as well as how institutions around the country are addressing the needs presented by the students meeting LLAS criteria.
In order to enroll students into the LLAS program, it is critical that their academic language ability is appropriately and accurately assessed. For this particular population of ESL students, that is challenging. It is challenging because the students come to the institution with different experiences and that has an enormous impact on how they are assessed for the program. Some arrive at post secondary institutions with experience in US education either in middle schools or high schools. Others have no US education experience but do have GED certificates. Still others bring with them some formal education abroad. They arrive with such a variety of educational experiences that finding one instrument to measure their academic readiness is complex at best. This challenge is not unique to MSU, Mankato. The growing numbers of immigrant ESL students at post secondary institutions across the US means that colleges and universities everywhere are facing unique challenges as they find ways to support this growing population.

Harklau, Losey and Sigal (1999) provide insights and reflections regarding how various institutions are handling the programmatic questions that have surfaced with this growing group of learners. They state, “In all, the picture that emerges in these chapters is of a tremendously diverse student population along continua of language proficiency, language affiliations, and academic literacy backgrounds. It is not surprising that colleges and universities have responded with a number of programmatic and placement options” (p. 5).

Spaventa and Williamson (1991) discuss the problems associated with ESL placement testing and state,
It is the thesis of this paper that a placement process in which administrators, students, and teachers participate as subjects of their own learning is better than a placement battery in which they are passive executors and recipients of standardized testing measures. This process orientated approach is very much in line with the view of Pennington and Brown....on the need for participatory approaches to language program curriculum. Furthermore we argue that current testing practices, dominated by psychometric rationale, fail to offer solutions to common problems of English language program placement (p.75).

This essay is insightful when considering assessment practices for program placement. As institutions grapple with the complexity of identifying students and then placing them into appropriate programs, it is important that they echo the overriding sentiment that one size does not fit all. Given the complex nature of the students backgrounds, the institutional resources, and the faculty and staff that may be involved in the assessment process, a more comprehensive approach and one in which everyone has equal accountability in the process is a sound argument.

2.1.1 Admissions Categorization

A major challenge faced at MSU is finding the immigrant ESL students as they arrive at the institution. It is not always clear who the students are because admissions records may not provide the indicators we need to identify them. At MSU, only 12 students out of 25 in the LLAS program in the first year were categorized as 03. The rest of the students were identified through looking at test scores, high school records and asking questions at orientation sessions as the students arrived. Some students arrive in the US, attain permanent resident or citizenship within a few years, and are not
categorized as 03. Yet as they enter post secondary institutions they could benefit from additional language support. The admission categorization can serve as one guide but certainly does not provide the only indication of the total numbers of students who might be encouraged to participate in the LLAS program.

MSU is starting to look beyond admissions records for other indicators that could provide further guides for finding students who may need additional language support as they enter the university. The identification process for this population of students must entail much more than one exam. Given the intricacies of the educational experiences already discussed, it is critical that some kinds of benchmarks are established as a way to begin the assessment process. Even though the identification process must be comprehensive and even fluid, and knowing one size and/or one test/measurement may not fit all, institutions still need some type of benchmark, test score or other indicator that provides a place to begin.

2.1.2 ACT English Score

Currently, MSU requires all incoming students to take the ACT college entrance exam. Not all students take this exam, which presents another set of challenges, but for those students who do take the exam, the English scores on that exam can provide a starting point. The ACT alone is not the only indicator that will help in this process but it provides a starting point.

A recent study, “Using ACT assessment Scores to Set Benchmarks for College Readiness” by Allen and Sconing, (2005) carefully looks at indicators for college readiness across four courses; English Composition, College Algebra, Social Science and Biology. This study is of particular interest to the LLAS program because it validates the
benchmark score of 18 that is initially utilized to indicate an incoming ESL immigrant student’s need for additional language support. The fact that the English portion of the ACT exam is not specifically developed for ESL learners could be seen as an advantage. Initially, little is known about the educational backgrounds of the immigrant students who arrive at MSU, so their test scores can be compared to non-immigrant/non-ESL students taking the same exams. Finding the ESL students who might benefit from the LLAS program amidst the diverse group of students coming to the university remains a challenge. Since the ACT English exam continues to be an indicator of a students’ readiness for functioning fairly well in academic writing at the college or university level, it makes little sense to seek out a separate exam for students for whom English is not their first language. The immigrant ESL students are being judged academically and admitted to universities just like students in the US who have grown up speaking English. Their high school ranks, high school records, GED certifications and/or other admissions criteria (like letters of recommendation, number of years in the US etc.) are all being utilized as means to accept or decline their admissions to universities in the US. This is quite different from international students who are taking the TOEFL exam because they are judged somewhat differently than US students for entrance. Since the immigrant ESL students are being judged with the same criteria that non-ESL US students are being judged, it makes sense to utilize the same benchmarks for both groups of students. Institutions and researchers continue to grapple with the question of whether or not ESL students should be judged by the same criteria as native speaking students. This is a valid question and one that needs to continue to be discussed. However, the reality is that as this particular group of students begins their coursework at the university, they are being
judged by the same criteria as native speaking students. Therefore, and until that practice is institutionally changed, it makes sense that we utilize the same benchmarks for both populations of students. The ACT English portion of the ACT exam then, is one realistic place to start.

In their study, Allen and Sconing (2005) established a benchmark of 18 for the subject of English Composition. Students who scored above 18 had a fairly good chance of passing English Composition in the first year of study with a score of B or better. Students scoring 18 or below were less likely to do well in English composition courses. This was found to be true at both 2-year and 4-year institutions across the country and they looked at 92 institutions total. With the exception of two students, all of the LLAS students scored below 18 on the English portion of the ACT exam. Not all students reported grades but based on all the scores available, the average English score was 12.

Allen and Sconning write,

The benchmark values represent a summary across many colleges and many students. Because the material covered in a course and the grading practices within the course vary among colleges, these scores are not necessarily appropriate for every college. Instead, the benchmark values represent predictive indicators of success for typical students at typical colleges. They give students, parents, and counselors an easy and reliable guide – a standardized point of reference as to whether a student has the knowledge and skills needed to have a reasonable chance of success in college. (p. 3).

Utilizing the benchmark score of 18 as a way to initially find immigrant ESL students to recruit for the LLAS program is validated by this study.
At MSU, the ACT exam helps provide a starting point or a beginning indicator of students' readiness for the language they need to be successful at MSU. It is also clear, however, that this score cannot function alone as the only indicator. Variables can impact such a test including students not being comfortable with exams in general, being poor test takers or not having sufficient English language skills. A benchmark score of 18 remains a good beginning but only the beginning. Since a score of 18 or below means a student will likely do poorly in composition, requiring the ACT exam is one way to assure MSU has a means of finding the students who may be at risk.

2.1.3 Individual Interview

Another indicator that can allow for a more thorough understanding of a student's language ability is through his/her own perception of his/her individual second language acquisition. One way to obtain additional evidence of a student's understanding of his/her own readiness for college level reading and writing lies with the student. Allowing a student to rationalize and consider his or her own level of academic literacy during an informal interview is an excellent way to elicit that information. Brown and Pennington (1991) discuss the different layers that require evaluation and how to complete evaluations of language programs. Although their article has to do with assessing programs as an ongoing process, Brown and Pennington state,

Interview procedures are often a relatively open-ended category of procedures.

Individual interviews allow for gathering personal responses and views privately. This confidentiality can, in turn, lead to insight into the true opinions of the participants involved, whereas other types of procedures such as questionnaires filled out during class time might fail to gather candid views (p. 9).
Second language learners are usually able, with more clarity than anyone else, to judge their own acquisition and if asked, articulate their own understanding of their ability to function at certain levels. When asked to talk about their own feelings about their second language acquisition for academic literacy and particularly reading, writing and vocabulary enrichment, many immigrant ESL students find a voice that helps them distinguish for themselves if they are ready to function reasonably well or if they would benefit from additional academic language support. An individual interview with the student becomes another important tool in the assessment process.

2.1.4 Number of Years in the US

Another indicator needing consideration in the identification process is the number of years a student has been in the US. Most immigrant students who have been in the US for ten years or more are prepared to function comfortably with college level English. Students who have been in the US (and in US schools) for shorter periods of time would probably benefit from additional language support for college level work. However, there are other variables to consider. Harklau (2003) states,

If the defining feature of Generation 1.5 students is that they are products of our own secondary education system, then we need to do a better job of understanding how that system prepares – or does not prepare- students for what we expect them to do in college. From the limited amount of research now available, we can say that most Generation 1.5 students in US school are educated exclusively in English. As a result, their literacy abilities are often more developed in English than in their native language. This profile tends to set them apart from international students. We can also say that the quality of their high school
writing experiences is highly variable and depends on a host of factors including the socioeconomic standing of their communities and school, levels of school and state support for bilingual students, teacher training and expectations for L2 learners, and ability to track placement for English classes. While some receive remedialized and simplistic instruction, others receive a high caliber, demanding curriculum (p. 153).

Because of the "highly variable" differences in high school writing instruction, it is not always clear which students are academically prepared to succeed at college. Some public high schools in the US, for a variety of reasons, do a less than adequate job of preparing students to write at the post secondary level. Such a lack of preparation is true for non-ESL and ESL students alike. These students will undoubtedly require assistance in developing and practicing the basic mechanics for academic writing. Other ESL and non-ESL students leave academically rigorous high schools fully prepared for the demands of post secondary writing. There are also those students who for varied reasons are encouraged or personally motivated to utilize available resources like a writing center or special tutorial sessions as they respond to college level writing assignments.

Therefore, looking at the kind of secondary institution (when possible) a student has attended as well as how long he/she has studied in the US is advisable. In general, ESL students who have been in the US (and in US schools) for longer periods of time seem to do a better job of reading, writing and acquiring the needed academic skills compared to ESL students who have been in the US for shorter periods of time. Such a conclusion is not always the case, but frequently enough that it should be considered. Number of years
in the US then, should be an additional indicator of readiness but must be looked at in combination with other assessment indicators.

2.1.5 A Timed Writing Exam

A timed writing assessment beyond the ACT provides another tool for placement into a program like the LLAS. A timed essay is only a snapshot of a student’s ability to write for academic purposes and like all the other indicators, should not be the only criteria utilized for placement. However, it is a valid component in the comprehensive assessment pieces.

Weigle (2002) discusses at some length the considerations administrators and educators must think about when developing writing assessments either in the classroom or as in the case of the LLAS program, prior to enrollment at an institution. Her book helps clarify the considerations one should make when thinking about assessment. The theoretical frameworks for best practices in developing and utilizing language tests as discussed by Douglas (2000) and Bachman and Palmer (1996) are highlighted in her book as they apply to writing assessment. Weigle’s book also provides rubrics that are useful guides for grading writing exams. “While it may not always be feasible to develop a different scoring rubric for every writing assignment, instructors should make sure there is an appropriate match between the writing task and the scoring rubric and that both are reflective of the TLU (target language use) domain.” (Weigle, 2002, p. 191) There is no disputing this claim but in administering a 30 minute test (which is all that time and resources might allow) prior to or within the first week of admission to the LLAS program, one can only make sure the rubric is as thorough as is possible for such a short amount of data and then one must generalize beyond that. In other words, no timed 30
minute essay by itself can truly demonstrate if a student is ready to function well in academic English. But a useful step is to make sure the rubric matches the TLU (which in this case is enormously general – to function successfully in academic writing and reading at the college level) and then further generalize from there. Weigle’s rubrics are very useful as a guide for this kind of snap shot assessment and are a useful place to begin considering all the factors that should be taken into account when creating a writing exam for the purpose of assessing LLAS students.

*SL Writing and Assessment Theories as they relate to the LLAS program/students*

A significant area of exploration in the program is in understanding how and when students acquire the tools they need for successful academic writing. This exploration should continue to inform classroom practices as well as assessments given to the students. Kross (2003) states,

> Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing is a timely collection of original papers surveying theory, research and practice in the teaching of second language writing. Each of the chapters provides a useful overview of a key topic in second language writing, identifying the major theoretical issues, surveying research finding and exploring applications to second language teaching. (p. xv)

Each of the essays within informs pedagogy, strategies and assessment practices significant to second language writing and writers. One essay that has particular impact is Hamp-Lyons (2003). She carefully identifies the very complex nature of writing assessment particularly in the L2 context. Hamp-Lyons points out, “I then argue for an approach to writing assessment that takes account of who the learner is, the context the learner has come from, and the context in which the learner must work toward
educational success" (p. 168). Hamp-Lyons identifies the very obscure and to a degree, non-researched nature of one critical component of second language writing assessment; the writer. She argues that as theoretical approaches morph and change with this fairly new field, the heart of all writing assessment research and practice should center on the writer being assessed. At the end of her essay she cautions, "Yet there is still a gap between best practice in teaching and responding to writing...and best practice in writing assessment, which are related topics. Furthermore, there are few contexts worldwide where best practice in either teaching or assessment of writing is actually taking place."

The essay cautions that we must be careful that our writing assessments actually target the skills we want to measure and at the same time, take into careful account the students/writers who are being measured. In the context of immigrant students entering post secondary study, that is complicated. Administrators, faculty and staff have to consider how writing assessments can inform placement and/or readiness for academic writing, enlighten pedagogical practices in the classroom after enrollment and perhaps most importantly, tell us something about the writers we are assessing.

2.2 General Theories of Assessment

The LLAS program requires continuous assessment. Not only should the students undergo assessments to verify they are learning and developing the English skills they need to succeed at MSU, but all the elements of the program including the curriculum, the program mission, the coordinator and the faculty who participate in the cohort courses need assessing. Although many of those elements are points for future research, applying assessment theories not only to the tests students are given but also the program in
general is necessary over time. Therefore, it’s important to look at some assessment theories in general as they can be applied not only to tests but also programming.

A 2003 publication by NAFSA titled *English Language Testing in U.S. Colleges and Universities* addresses some of the challenges institutions across the country face as they administer exams to ESL students. Although this collection of essays is geared toward the testing of international ESL students, the same considerations must be made for testing immigrant ESL students. Douglas (2003) states, “Perhaps the most common purposes of on campus-testing is that of getting a more finely-tuned assessment of the specific English language abilities of students, often in the context of a particular program of study, so that appropriate ESL courses can be offered to address needs identified by the test” (p. 4). This is absolutely true for the immigrant ESL students arriving at MSU and is one of the major challenges the LLAS program must address for its continued success. As the article continues, Douglas talks about the stakeholders who participate in the testing process; students, administrators, instructors, etc... and states that they, “…will want to demonstrate that their tests in fact measure what they are intended to measure and that the interpretations and decisions made on the basis of test performance are justified” (p. 6). Developing an assessment tool that can measure a students academic language preparedness to study at MSU and furthering that assessment by demonstrating that the results are justifiable remains a challenging goal as the LLAS program continues to grow.

Another article in the book that helps frame issues in developing and administering tests at colleges and universities is by Chapelle (2003). She writes,
In choosing or developing a test, ideally the test user should have three aspects of test purpose in mind. The first, inference, refers to what the test user wants to be able to infer about the learners on the basis of their test scores. The second aspect of the test purpose is the most obvious to test user, who want to use test for making decisions and giving grades. Typically, some kind of action is associated with test scores, and this is the test use. The third aspect of test purpose is something that test users do not always consider but should: in what ways will the test affect students, teachers, teaching and the institutions more broadly? (p. 108).

Chapelle summarizes her main points at the end of the article,

In this chapter, we explored the seemingly obvious and straightforward idea that tests used to assess English language ability should be valid. We saw that the idea that a test should be valid is really a short handed way of saying something much more complex: that we would like to have some evidence suggesting that a particular test would be valid for a particular purpose in a particular context. (p. 114).

Gathering that evidence for the purpose of placing students into the LLAS program requires time at MSU. Chapelle’s arguments and this article are noteworthy as that process begins. In the meantime, utilizing a number of assessment indicators may be one way to provide evidence suggesting a student should or should not be placed into the LLAS program.

Douglas (2000) discusses the many frameworks that should be considered in creating or utilizing assessments for specific purpose language use. He carefully
discusses the ways in which test givers, test takers, specific language purpose instructors and language program developers should consider their assessment practices as they build and/or assess language programs for specific purposes. The theoretical frameworks discussed in the book are quite complex but one might generalize that the overriding claim being made is that any assessment of language must be based on the context and specific language use the learner will find himself/herself utilizing. An argument could be made that the academic language needed to survive at a college or university is idiosyncratic. It is dependent upon the culture and academic community at a specific institution and therefore, it is essentially a type of language used for a specific purpose (in this case academic discourse at MSU, Mankato). Therefore, the assessment frameworks defined in Douglas’s book are irrefutably applicable when planning assessment practices.

Douglas (2000) claims, “A specific purpose language test is one in which test content and methods are derived from an analysis of a specific purpose target language use situation, so that test tasks and content are authentically representative of tasks in the target situation, allowing for an interaction between the test taker’s language ability and specific purpose content knowledge, on the one hand, and the test task on the other. Such a test allows us to make inferences about a test taker’s capacity to use language in the specific purpose domain.” (p.19). Such a theoretical framework as Douglas outlines is important to consider when planning exams and assessments that might be used to determine the immigrant ESL student’s readiness for academic English language use. The “specific purpose content knowledge” in this case is a very general one – the goal being to determine if a student is able to write and read in English reasonably well enough to function at the college level. Creating a test task that could provide that
information as a student enters the university and continuing to utilize a test that could measure academic readiness through-out participation in the LLAS program is challenging. However, an effort should be made to create such an exam and in creating one exam or a series of exams, looking at the frameworks laid out by Douglas in this book is one place to begin.

2.3 Programming

Finally, the literature review for this paper would not be complete without briefly discussing content based ESL programming. The students’ context (first year students at MSU, Mankato) and the content of their coursework through-out their first year of study, all contribute to the pedagogical practices and language development focused on in the ESL 210 classroom. The research about content based study and contextualized learning is vast. Kasper (2000) offers insight into the programming and research being done regarding instruction. Babbit and Mlynarczyk (2000) state, “When learning is shared in a linked or theme-based environment, ESL students begin to feel connected to one another, to the subject matter, and to the institution in which they are studying. They are no longer passive students absorbing information, but they are actively constructing knowledge and defining their own connections to and roles in the institution” (p. 45). The hope of the LLAS program is that through the content based learning taking place, the students will indeed feel more connected at MSU.

This literature review does not address the curriculum development for the ESL 210 course. That is an area for future research. However, it is important to briefly discuss one text that helps to inform curriculum as it relates to writing teaching and “Generation 1.5”. Dana Ferris’s book, *Treatment of Error in Second Language Student*
Writing (2002), examines second language acquisition and the implications for error corrections and feedback for student writing. The book has many valid arguments about why it is important to offer comprehensive and useful feedback to ESL writers and how that is both a critical and complicated process. “First, it is unrealistic to expect that L2 writers production will be error free or that, even when it is, it will “sound” like that of native English speakers. Second, since SLA takes time, we should not expect students’ accuracy to improve overnight. Third, and most important for the purposes of this book, L2 student writers need: (a) a focus on different linguistic issues or error patterns than native speakers do; (b) feedback or error correction that is tailored to their linguistic knowledge and experience; and (c) instruction that is sensitive to their unique linguistic deficits and needs for strategy training” (Ferris, 2002, p. 5). This is an important text as programming and curriculum development are assessed for the LLAS program.

Harklau reminds readers of the continuing challenges as well as the expanding opportunities to understand and provide services to the immigrant ESL student population. The following quote helps frame approaches to future programming, research and curriculum development for this group of students. Harklau (2003) writes,

Finally, I would like to caution against tendencies to reify the term “Generation 1.5”. I try to limit my use of the term to active learners of English for at least two reasons. First, we live in a society that tends to equate “American” with “whiteness,” (Harklau, 2000), where the term Generation 1.5 may inadvertently contribute to a representation of students as perpetual foreigners no matter how long they have resided in the U.S. Second, I am concerned that this term can be seized upon by the public discourse on college literacy, with great
potential for misuse. I look back at Batholomae’s (1993) often cited article on how the category of “basic writer” has become essentialized and taken for granted in institutional discourse. It occurs to me that like “basic writer,” the term “Generation 1.5” unfortunately lends itself far too easily to essentializing and to a discourse of need -- a way to label bilingual students as in need of remediation.

My hope is that the notion of the “Generation 1.5” writers remains useful as a means to look at our students and our programs in a new way, but at the same time I also hope it remains contested and unstable.

In all, I believe that the new attention to Generation 1.5 students benefits the field as a whole by pointing out the need to develop more diverse and context-sensitive notions of second language writers and second language writing.

Although we have more questions than answers at present, the active scholarly community forming around these issues will no doubt produce new and challenging perspectives in years to come (p. 156).

Is the LLAS program as it is currently set up, meeting the needs of the students? By examining literature for best practices in assessment, looking at literature that informs programming, and investigating pedagogy to explore curriculum development for the ESL 210 course, the LLAS program should continue to grow, evolve and become more successful with time.
CHAPTER THREE

Data

This will examine a variety of data focusing on the question of whether or not the LLAS program, as currently organized, is meeting the needs of the immigrant students at MSU. This chapter will review the following data; 1) information about the students who participated in the LLAS program during the academic year 2004-2005 compared to students of similar backgrounds who opted not to participate in the program and 2) admissions data of three students student who voluntarily enrolled in the LLAS program for one academic year.

3.1 LLAS Students and Non-LLAS students

The following Tables provide information about the students participating in the LLAS program in the fall and in the spring (Table 1) and students recruited for the LLAS program but who opted not to enroll in the program (Table 2). Similar admission criteria (classified as 03 in admissions and/or had ACT English scores of 18 or below) were utilized for both groups of students. These tables show the grades students received in the courses that the LLAS program is meant to support. They also include over all GPA rankings for each semester.

Table 1 includes the following information: Column 1 provides the initials of the students who participated in the program either in the fall or the spring. Column 2 shows how each student was coded by the admissions office. Columns 3 and 4 indicate whether they participated (Y = participated in LLAS, N = did not participate in LLAS) for the fall and spring semesters. Columns 5 and 6 provide the Grade Point Averages (GPA) at the end of each semester. Columns 7 – 14 show the grades each student received in the
courses the program is meant to support. Not all the students took every course supported by the cohort which is why there is not a grade listed for that class/student.

**TABLE 1 - LLAS Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Initials</th>
<th>Admit Code</th>
<th>Enrolled LLAS Fall</th>
<th>Enrolled LLAS Spring</th>
<th>GPA Fall</th>
<th>GPA Spring</th>
<th>Grade Speech 100 or 101</th>
<th>Grade Ethnic Studies 100 or 101</th>
<th>Grade English 100</th>
<th>Grade English 101</th>
<th>Grade Math 98 or 112</th>
<th>Grade Bio 100 or 105</th>
<th>Grade Chem 104 or 106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A, H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, S</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B, N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, P</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D, W</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E, H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H, H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H, K</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, Y</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, K</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L, T</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N, V</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N, I</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, Y</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O, S</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P, L</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S, R</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, K</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T, P</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V, L</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X, B</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y, S</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 provides the same information as Table 1 described above. The students identified in this table were students who all had the admissions codes of 03 (immigrant, refugee, asylum) and also had ACT scores of 18 or below. For varied reasons the students profiled in Table 2 are those who opted not to participate in the program.
TABLE 2 – Non-LLAS Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Initials</th>
<th>Admit Code</th>
<th>Enrolled LLAS Fall</th>
<th>Enrolled LLAS Spring</th>
<th>GPA Fall</th>
<th>GPA Spring</th>
<th>Grade Speech 100 or 101</th>
<th>Grade English 100</th>
<th>Grade English 98 or 112</th>
<th>Grade ESL 210</th>
<th>Grade Bio 100 or 105</th>
<th>Grade Chem 104 or 106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A,L</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,L</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B,M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D,M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F,D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H,A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I,M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J,D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K,M</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L,C</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M,W</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N,Z</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O,N</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O,H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P,R</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S,D</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S,E</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S,T</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S,F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S,A</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X,O</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y,H</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y,F</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,O</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second column (titled Admit code) highlights the challenge of finding students for the program. All the students in Table 2 were coded as 03. The Admissions office at MSU codes all students this way if they are not yet US citizens nor considered international students. The 03 admission category helps to identify a student as having refugee, asylum or permanent resident status. However, many of the students admitted to the LLAS program in the fall of 2004 did not receive the admissions code of 03 (see column 2, Table 1). Some of the students obtained citizenship within the past five or ten years and therefore were not given a code. Others self identified as Asian American on their admissions application and those students received a code of 02 (indicating Asian
American. Although all of the students immigrated to the US and speak a first language other than English, that is not apparent by their admissions code alone. Such coding or absence of same highlights the challenge the university faces finding immigrant ESL students as they begin their studies. Since only 46% (13 out of 28 LLAS students) in Table 1 were coded as 03, a significant question remains: How many students fit the criteria of a student who would benefit from the LLAS program that are not being identified through their admissions code?

The following data is based on information derived from Tables 1 and 2.

**TABLE 3 - Averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average cumulative GPA for LLAS students after one year of study at MSU</th>
<th>Average cumulative GPA for Non-LLAS students after one year of study at MSU</th>
<th>Average cumulative GPA for all first year students at MSU</th>
<th>Percentage of LLAS students with a 3.0 GPA or above after one year</th>
<th>Percentage of Non-LLAS students with a GPA of 3.0 or above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average cumulative GPA (over the first two semesters) for students enrolled in the LLAS program was 3.31. The average cumulative GPA (over the first two semesters) for students of similar demographic backgrounds who opted not to enroll in the program was 2.67. The percentage of LLAS students who have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 (or above) after one year is 79%. The percentage of non-LLAS students who have a cumulative GPA of 3.0 (or above) after one year is 50%. In general, the LLAS student faired well in over all grades and received reasonably good grades in the courses that the program supported. The cumulative average GPA for all first year students at MSU for the academic year 2004/2005 was 2.61. Based on the average GPA statistics alone, the
claim can be made that the students who enrolled in the LLAS program did at least as well as (and in most cases better than) their peers during their first year of study at MSU.

The grades in the courses the program supports are more challenging to evaluate. The total number of grades reported for the LLAS cohort across courses that the program supports is 140. The total number of grades reported for the Non-LLAS cohort across courses the program supports is 32. Keeping in mind the number differences, the following two tables provide limited but interesting data:

**TABLE 4 – Letter Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Letter grades of A across coursework</th>
<th>Total Letter grades of B across coursework</th>
<th>Total Letter grades of C across coursework</th>
<th>Total Letter grades of D across coursework</th>
<th>Total Letter grades of F across coursework</th>
<th>Total number of withdraws across coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLAS Cohort</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LLAS Cohort</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5 – Percentages of Letter Grades**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage of letter grade A across coursework</th>
<th>Percentage of letter grade B across coursework</th>
<th>Percentage of letter grade C across coursework</th>
<th>Percentage of letter grade D across coursework</th>
<th>Percentage of letter grade F across coursework</th>
<th>Percentage withdraws across coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LLAS Cohort</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-LLAS Cohort</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the first year of study, none of the LLAS students received letter grades of F in any of their coursework. 13% of the Non-LLAS received letter grades of F across coursework. The percentage of withdraws for the LLAS cohort was lower than the Non-LLAS cohort. This percentage could be read a number of different ways. Perhaps some of the LLAS students made good choices about their coursework, linguistically or otherwise thus making good choices about being better prepared. Or, perhaps the LLAS program did enough to support those courses in their first year of study. Yet, even though limited data is available at this time, the evaluation of the tables helps move forward the research question posed earlier.

3.2 Three Case Studies

Though gender is not a factor in the data, “she” will always be used when examining the case studies of Students A, B and C.

Background:

These case studies will examine the admissions and written data of three students who voluntarily participated in the LLAS program for the 22004/2005 academic year. These individuals were selected for the case studies because they meet many of the profile criteria for students the LLAS program should target. They all voluntarily enrolled and remained in the program for one academic year. They are continuing their studies at MSU and from all informal reports, doing well academically this current year.

The five assessment indicators mentioned in the literature review are explored in these case studies to shed as much insight into the question of whether those indicators are working and/or need modifying. Those assessment indicators are; 1) admissions
categorization, 2) ACT English score, 3) number of years in the US and in US schools, 4) individual interview, 5) a timed writing.

These students were all coded as 03 by admissions identifying them as immigrant students entering the university. Their ACT English scores differ slightly but all feel below 18 offering another indicator of readiness for college level English reading and writing. Their number of years in the US and in US schools was also considered. This information is tabled below.

**Table 6 -Initial Assessment indicators for Student A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions Code and High School Rank</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Number of years in the US and/or number of years in US school</th>
<th>Number of years of English study either abroad or in US</th>
<th>ACT English Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Code :03 High School Rank: Top 50% of graduating class.</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4 years in the US and 4 years of study in US high school</td>
<td>Studied English in home school before arriving in US plus 4 years in US</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student A meets three of the criteria indicating a student’s need for the LLAS program; 1) she has been in the US for less than 10 years and has studied in the US for four, 2) her admission categorization is 03, indicating an immigrant student, and 3) her ACT English score is 12 – well below the cut off score of 18 that should indicate readiness for academic writing. However, these indicators are only glimpses. It is not clear from these pieces of data what kind of education she received in high school. Nor is
it clear why she received a lower score on the ACT English test. Perhaps that score has to do with test taking ability and nothing to do with language ability. Finally, she was coded by the Admission office as 03 but because the coding system is not flawless, it’s important that further indicators are gathered.

**Table 7 - Initial Assessment indicators for Student B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions Code and High School Rank</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Number of years in the US and/or number of years in US school</th>
<th>Number of years of English study either abroad or in US</th>
<th>ACT English Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Code: 03 Did not attend US High School</td>
<td>The Sudan</td>
<td>½ a year of residence in the US but no formal education in US schools</td>
<td>12 years of study in the Sudan and Ethiopia – included study of English language- education interrupted but completed formal education abroad</td>
<td>No recorded English ACT score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student B also meets three of three of the criteria indicating a student’s need for the LLAS program; 1) she has been in the US for less than 10 years and but has had nor formal education in the US. However, this student does indicate significant English study abroad although it is difficult to judge the level of formality because an academic transcript is not available here. 2) her admission categorization is 03, indicating an immigrant student, and 3) there is no reported ACT English score – this certainly is a cause for further evaluation.
Table 8 - Initial Assessment indicators for Student C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions Code and High School Rank</th>
<th>Country of Birth</th>
<th>Number of years in the US and/or number of years in US school</th>
<th>Number of years of English study either abroad or in US</th>
<th>ACT English Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Code: 03</td>
<td>Oromiya</td>
<td>3 years in the US and 3 years in US high school</td>
<td>10 years in home country</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student C meets three of three of the criteria indicating a need for the LLAS program; 1) she has been in the US for 3 years and in a US high school for 3 years, 2) her admission categorization is 03, indicating an immigrant student, and 3) her ACT score is 9 which is well below the cut off score established by Allen and Sconing in their study. By looking at the three initial indicators, it is clear this student is a good candidate for the program so there is need to continue to evaluate her.

During the summer orientation (2004), all three students met with the coordinator of the program to learn more about the LLAS program. An interview was conducted and they each reflected upon their own second language acquisition and readiness for college level reading and writing. Self reflection came not only from the interview but also from a voluntary questionnaire completed after the interview. The questionnaire asked the students to rank their abilities in six areas of academic language. All three students responses are tabled below:
Table 9 - Voluntary Questionnaire Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Entry</th>
<th>Not Difficult 1</th>
<th>Somewhat Difficult 2</th>
<th>Difficult 3</th>
<th>Very Difficult 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Listening Comprehension (you can understand and follow lectures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking English in Academic Environments (you are comfortable asking questions in class and participating in group discussions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Academic Texts (you read easily, quickly, and understand almost everything)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Papers (you can write easily and express your ideas clearly)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researching a topic (you are comfortable finding sources and quoting/citing those sources for your research)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proofreading/Editing in English (you are comfortable correcting your English writing for grammar and language errors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This questionnaire identifies how each student feels about their ability to complete the academic tasks listed above. This also provides insight about their understanding of their individual language acquisition. On the questionnaire they all (with the exception of one student) indicate a lack of comfort with many of the skills required to succeed academically at the post secondary level. Such discomfort may indicate a need for a supportive language program like LLAS.

The last question of the questionnaire asks:
What do you hope to achieve by participating in the LLAS program?

Student A’s response: “I hope to have more time to concentrate on a level of English that I never reached before.”

Student B’s response: “I will get a lot of experiences and learn many things.”

Student C’s response: “To get better on my righting.”

These responses provide further indicators regarding the students’ insecurity with certain academic skills. Student A’s response would indicate that she does not feel she has reached a level of English needed at the college level. Student B’s response is more vague but she certainly would like to learn more skills. Student C is clearly indicating a concern about writing. All express that there are skills they would like to develop.

During the interview, each student was prompted to talk about her comfort level with academic reading, writing and critical inquiry. As the students talked about their level of academic literacy, the coordinator of the program took notes to track what they said.

3.3 Reflections of Interview with Student A

Student A indicated a comfort level with speaking but had great concerns about academic writing. She shared that her high school writing experience was very limited. Being so, she expressed real concern about her ability to write a university level academic essay. She was anxious to receive any additional help in that area and that was her primary reason for wanting to participate in the LLAS program. She also indicated that any support she could receive to help her adjust to MSU was welcome. Like any new student, she seemed nervous, anxious and excited to begin her studies and was looking for advice and a place to get answers about many questions. She indicated
concerns about adjusting to the MSU culture, figuring out her financial aid, learning how to write and read at the college level, and making friends. All of these concerns were documented by the coordinator.

The coordinator also noted that Student A is an excellent speaker of English and in fact, was admitted to MSU on a speech scholarship because her excellent work with her high school speech team. However, the written survey and the interview point toward her lack of confidence in reading and writing at the university level.

3.4 Reflections of Interview with Student B

Student B explains that sometimes people have difficulty understanding her speech; however, she states that she is a good writer and wants to major in journalism. Even though B is fairly confident in her ability to write academically, she feels strongly that she should participate in the program because she wants to bridge the gap between what she knows and what is expected at MSU.

Student B’s command of spoken English is fine with a very strong accent. For the average listener, this may cause communication break downs. She appears confident about her written acquisition and makes the claim that some of her schooling abroad was in English. The student is aware that the LLAS program has a strong writing focus, and even knowing that, Student B is adamant about enrolling in the program. Student B was encouraged to (and did) enroll in the LLAS program.

3.5 Reflections of Interview with Student C

Student C was asked how she felt about her ability to read and write at the college level. She immediately made the comment that she had never studied in US schools without additional ESL help and she would not dream of attending university without that
support. She was adamant that she needed assistance with reading and writing. She clearly lacks confidence in her ability to function adequately in English writing at the college level and demonstrates a great deal of anxiety about this and other academic skills.

3.6 Final thoughts about the individual interviews

The awareness the students demonstrated regarding their own ability to read and write university level assignments is perhaps one of the more critical components of the assessment process. Allowing a student to take ownership of her own level of academic literacy helps her become a stakeholder in her academic track. Because the LLAS program is voluntary, this ownership is a vital step. In all three cases, the comprehensive data thus far indicates enrollment in the program would benefit their academic success. All three students voluntarily enrolled in the LLAS program.

3.7 Writing Samples

The next important step is to authenticate these initial indicators. A timed essay was given during the first week of the semester. This was done so Student A had an opportunity to "test out" of the program within the first week. It was also done as a way to provide another assessment indicator to validate her enrollment in the LLAS program.

The in class timed essay is a tool to help evaluate a student's writing ability. However, continued assessment of the test itself is advisable because it may not be the best reflection of academic writing. In general, students do not encounter timed essays except perhaps during exams. More typically students have time to compose and even revise their work. Also they are often writing on topics generated by their current reading. An in class timed essay in the first week of class then, could be thought of as a
snap shot look at a student’s ability to think quickly about a topic and then compose an essay in response to that topic.

It is important the rubric reflect the intention of the timed essay exam. The rubric must be specific enough to provide some way to judge the exam but also be general enough to reflect that which is being tested (the ability to think quickly and then write about a topic in a cohesive way for academic purposes). Following the frameworks established by Bachman and Palmer and then furthered by Douglas, the rubric should reflect the language knowledge needing to be tested. Components of language knowledge, as defined by Douglas (2000) are a combination of grammatical knowledge, textual knowledge, functional knowledge and sociolinguistic knowledge. Additional components needing consideration as discussed by Douglas (2003) are strategic competence and background knowledge. However, because this exam is brief and only a snap shot, the rubric here only reflects language knowledge.

For this snap shot assessment, the student was given a general topic to write about. The exam was modeled after the writing exam given to all incoming undergraduate international students at Iowa State University in Ames, IA. It reads as follows:

Instructions: You have 30 minutes to think about the assigned topic, organize your ideas and write your composition. You may take notes on the first page to guide your writing. You may not use a dictionary. Your composition will be evaluated on the development of ideas, organization and language use, including grammar and expression.

Topic: All of us must live within certain societal norms or shared rules, some with which we disagree. Identify one societal norm or shared rule and explain to your reader either why you believe it should be abolished or why it should be kept. You could consider a government, religious, school or family rule.
### Table 10 - The rubric used to judge the writing exam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization/Development</th>
<th>Fluency/Expression</th>
<th>Accuracy/Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well developed topic, examples provided, transitions between ideas</td>
<td>Shows extensive vocabulary range</td>
<td>No editing difficulty – no grammatical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 pts</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear organization, intro may be short or obvious, clear focus of ideas and topics.</td>
<td>Writing may include some unusual idioms but generally sound vocabulary</td>
<td>Some errors but not many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
<td>4 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall organization is evident, not well developed topics, few or no examples provided</td>
<td>Some unusual vocabulary choices and perhaps unusual idioms but fairly easy to follow</td>
<td>Some editing errors, ed endings, plurals, tense choices but none that slow reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
<td>3 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization jumps around, few transition markers, no examples and limited development</td>
<td>Evidence of language transfer, almost reads like translation, struggles with language</td>
<td>Errors make it difficult to follow/read essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 pts</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
<td>2 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization not very evident</td>
<td>Very difficult to follow</td>
<td>Little evidence of editing control, many errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
<td>1 pt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 - Over all scores and their meanings based on the rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 points or more when all categories are totaled</th>
<th>9 – 12 points when all categories are totaled</th>
<th>8 points or below when all categories are totaled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student demonstrates ability to write well for academic purposes. Student may not need to enroll in the LLAS program. It is a voluntary program but student should be advised that their score reflects ability to write well for academic purposes.</td>
<td>Student demonstrates a borderline ability in academic writing. Might be able to function fairly well with lots of tutoring support although that is not entirely clear. One semester of participation in the LLAS program is advisable.</td>
<td>Student needs to enroll in the LLAS program. Essay indicated that time to develop language for academic purposes is advisable. Student demonstrates need for help with sentence formation, vocabulary enrichment, reading and writing skills for academic purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few important elements of this particular exam needing continuous review: 1) the cut off scores above are based on totaling up the language knowledge from the rubric and making generalization from there. 2) Only one person rated this writing sample. In order to validate a score, it should be noted that whenever possible, a minimum of three raters should be utilized. Two to provide the initial scores and if there is any disagreement, a third rater can validate a score. Such additional readership is a more accurate way to rate an exam. However, the resources for this purpose did not allow for that depth and only one rater was available to judge the exam.

Writing Sample from Student A:

Growing up in a house of seven children is not easy especially when all the rules apply to you regardless of your age. I for starters though that once I finish high school I could go to bed at anytime. Sadly thought last summer I found out that according to my family rules family members should always go to sleep at the same time. So I personally believe that this rule should be abolished and here are the three reasons why I say so, first I am the second oldest in my family. Second my three year old brother’s habits of sleeping are not the same as mine and third as a family we don’t have to be conservatives.
First there should always be some advantages of being the second oldest in your house, unfortunately I don’t have one. I as an older sister should be the one that is telling my younger siblings when to sleep, making sure that bedrooms are nicely done. I would not be able to do that if I sleep with them and they will never know the beauty of having an older sister that checks on you when you are asleep.

Second, not to sound so selfish I don’t believe my younger family members and I have the same (?). At my age I could need to speak on the phone late at night or even just go out. On the other hand while mind are expanding they should get eight hours of sleep. However I am in my late teenage years and I don’t believe that I would need eight hours of sleep. The time I set for myself would work perfectly fine for my body and mind.

Finally, my family needs to change one rule to see the good that comes out of us. We are all different individuals so we should be treated like that.

So in conclusion I would say that I believer my family rules of all of us sleeping at the same time should be abolished for all the reasons I just list above.

Student A received the following score:

Organization/Development 3, Fluency/Expression 4, Grammar/Accuracy 4
Total points: 11

This student is assessed as border line. She demonstrates an ability to write clearly and organizes her ideas pretty well. She follows the standard academic format for paragraph writing. However, she does not demonstrate extensive vocabulary range and that may be due to topic choice. An example of this can be found in paragraph three. The paragraph (below) is organized fairly well but the language is simple. She doesn’t combine her sentences in this paragraph or express a range of vocabulary terms that might be considered more academic:

Second, not to sound so selfish I don’t believe my younger family members and I have the same (?). At my age I could need to speak on the phone late at night or even just go out. On the other hand while mind are expanding they should get eight hours of sleep. However I am in my late teenage years and I don’t believe that I would need eight hours of sleep. The time I set for myself would work perfectly fine for my body and mind.

Her writing is free of distracting errors but the sentence structure is unusual. An example is sentence three of the same paragraph: On the other hand while mind are expanding they should get eight hour of sleep. The dependent clause “while mind are expanding” does not connect to “they”. The lack of agreement in the sentence is not terribly distracting since a reader can generally know what is meant. There remains the concern for stronger command of academic writing norms. Although she demonstrates some academic writing competence, more development of academic writing skills is a fitting recommendation for her.
Writing Sample from Student B:

Wearing Head Scarf (cover) in School
I strongly disagree with some governments that have proposed children at schools should abolish wearing head scarfs when they are in class. This proposal would be against other religions and cultures, for example in some cultures, women cover their heads. This is also applied to Jews and some Muslim countries so I think that idea could bring of conflict between country that enforce this idea to its own citizens.

School Norm
I believe it is a gross violation for a student to come in class while she/he gets drunk however. Such a student should be called up on and explained why he/she did such a thing.

Student B received the following score:

Organization/Development 2, Fluency/Expression 3, Accuracy/Grammar 3
Total Points: 8

The essay is demonstrating the student should work on developing a topic and writing about it with clarity. There are two topics in this short writing passage; Wearing a Head Scarf and School Norm. Although they both relate to rules, neither topic is well developed, nor is it clear why they are written about in the same essay. The short writing sample does show that the student has fairly good vocabulary and a basic command of sentence structure. However, she needs to work on organization and development for academic writing.

Writing Sample from Student C:

All of us must live within certain societal norms or rules, some with which we disagree. The society I leave we rules the gan sercemisation. I don't think that rules is good for the society I leave. It can affect your health in many ways. To my idey to teach them to abolished that rule. I think this rules are in many country in Africa.

Student C received the following score:

Organization/Development 1, Fluency/Expression 1, Accuracy/Grammar 1
Total Score: 3

Student C is encouraged to remain in the LLAS program. The writing sample demonstrates she needs time to develop writing skills at the college level. This short sample also shows that she struggles with spelling and vocabulary choice. An example is in sentence two, “The society I leave.....” The spelling of society and the world choice of “leave” instead of “live” is confusing. Having time to acquire more vocabulary so she has a better and broader understanding of academic language will be useful. Additionally, working on basic sentence structure is advisable for her. The sentence, “To
my idey to teach them to abolish that rule." demonstrates that she needs to work on the subject followed by verb followed by object order basic for academic writing. This student requires help developing skills in all areas of academic writing.

Given all the other assessment indicators reviewed for Students A, B and C, they are encouraged to stay in the LLAS program for at least one semester, after which further assessments can take place. The case studies demonstrate two important points, 1) there is need to have more than one indicator in place until a more comprehensive assessment tool can be developed because 2) the students have a range of academic backgrounds and skills sets. The comprehensive assessment indicators allow exploration of that range of academic knowledge and background revealed in these case studies.

Most important in these assessment indicators was the fact that the students themselves selected into the program. Because the program is voluntary and because they were extensively interviewed about their own level of academic literacy, they have the best vantage point to inform their own decisions. These students voluntarily stayed in the LLAS program for an entire year.

How do the assessment indicators relate to the question of whether or not the LLAS program, as it currently operates is meeting the needs of the students? These case studies provide a glimpse into the challenge remaining when examining that question. Until a more thorough instrument can be developed, looking at a range of assessment indicators is one way we can meet the students' needs as they enter the university. By recognizing that their vast and varied educational experiences mean they each bring different levels of academic literacy to the institution, by allowing them to self-identify their own levels of academic reading and writing ability and thereby self-selecting into
the program, and by validating their enrollment through some type of snap shot writing assessment, the program is on the path of making sure students are a good match for the LLAS program.
CHAPTER FOUR

Conclusion

Overall Summary of Question

Chapter 3 highlights some ways the LLAS program can begin answering the question of whether or not the program is meeting the needs of the students. First, the comparative data for both participating students as well as those who opted not to participate requires continued evaluation. As the students continue their studies, more comparative data about the program’s impact should be available. The current data does however allow a glimpse at some initial claims. Compared to the general first year populations and students who opted not to participate, students enrolled in the LLAS program during the 2004/2005 academic year have a higher GPA average. Also, students in the program did reasonably well in courses that the program is supporting. None of the participating students failed any course during their first year of study at MSU.

Examining assessment indicators is another way to focus on the meeting the needs question. Measuring the indicators currently in place to identify potential students will help in the recruitment process. The case studies demonstrate that a comprehensive set of indicators did help place students into the program. Realizing the program’s value as it related to their academic language development, the students voluntarily enrolled for one academic year. Continuing to make sure there are multiple ways to validate students enrollment in the program will assure greater success in identifying students best served through LLAS. Each of the assessment indicators offers some insight about a student’s ability to negotiate the reading, writing and critical inquiry skills needed to succeed at MSU. Measured together the indicators create an even greater indication of readiness to
parley the linguistic demands of post secondary study at MSU. One size does not fit all and understanding the depth of each student’s individual experience through a number of assessment indicators is a vital element for placing them into the program.

4.1 Limitations of the Study

Although there does exist useful data to start answering the meeting the needs question, at this point in time that data is limited. Looking at continued retention at MSU, evaluating GPA ranking and grades in a variety or courses, and continuing over time to survey the first group of students will certainly provide expand the data base. Certainly advisable would be replicating some of the questions asked by Robin Murie for the program’s initial evaluation. Tracking over time the academic progress of the students who opted not to enroll in the program will also add data to help address the basic research question of the effectiveness of the LLAS program in meeting the student’s needs.

4.2 Implications for Program Development

A future goal for the LLAS program is developing a more accurate way of identifying the students who could benefit from the program. Requiring the ACT English score before a student is admitted to MSU is one way to accomplish this goal. Knowing which students score 18 or below will help faculty, staff and administrators make informed decisions about course placement and additional services that will support students learning. Requiring the ACT English scores upon admission is a necessary tool for identifying students.

As the LLAS program matures, it is important that more than one assessment measurement is used to place students into the program. A comprehensive approach to
the assessment process is advisable because utilizing more than one instrument allows opportunities to evaluate many facets of the individual student. The immigrant ESL student group arrives at post secondary institutions with a wide range of academic and literacy backgrounds. Because of the diverse nature of their academic backgrounds, it is important that validation of their possibly enrollment into the LLAS program emerges through a variety of means. Those means ought to include: 1. The number of years a student has been in the US and in US schools (and any academic background information that can be attained from those schools). 2. An ACT English score or some other English language assessment score that can offer a guide for English language competence. 3. An individual interview with the student to determine how he/she feels about his/her own level of academic literacy and/or preparedness for post secondary study. 4. A reading/writing assessment that is well developed and may offer further insight into the students ability to read, analyze and write at the university level. All of these assessment indicators should be utilized collectively to make the best decision about students’ academic language ability as they enter MSU. Developing an assessment instrument that may be able to provide this information in one sitting should be a continual focus for LLAS.

Another focus of the program must be to answer the following question: What kind of curriculum best facilitates immigrant ESL students’ development for college level reading and writing? The program must grow ways to assess and measure this because it is the primary goal of the program. Therefore, it is imperative that development is evaluated over time. Further study about the impact and usefulness of the LLAS curriculum should take place.
As the LLAS program continues to develop and evolve, it is important to remain sensitive to numerous issues surrounding needs of LLAS students. The continuing challenge of finding and placing students into the program, as well as the expanding opportunities to make a difference in the lives of students through useful programming and a specialized and challenging curriculum must guide the future focus and on-going research of the LLAS program.

The preliminary data is positive. The students who enrolled in the LLAS program are successful academically. The data comparing LLAS students to non-LLAS students and the general population indicates that the LLAS group is averaging a higher GPA than the other two groups. The program is succeeding and should continue to exist.
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