

## CHAPTER 16

# CAMPUS INTERNATIONALIZATION: A CENTER-BASED MODEL FOR ESL- READY PROGRAMS

**Karyn E. Mallett and Ghania Zgheib**

George Mason University

*Historically in US higher education, the WAC-driven push for institution-wide integration of writing into the curriculum has not been met by substantive language support for L2 writers. In this article, a language-supported approach to campus internationalization is described, contributing to discussions on innovative ways in which the nation-wide WAC agenda might adapt to growing international enrollments. The model presented – the ACCESS program – is an emerging ESL-ready program that has benefitted from the guidance of a well-connected team of writing specialists across the university, including WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics faculty. Research on the ACCESS program is provided, the results of which showcase ways in which faculty and students benefit from a program structure that is comprehensive, realistic, and transferrable to other contexts across the university. The authors conclude by suggesting that the institutional energy that goes into developing language-supported programs for international students should open the door to wider conversations about the language and writing needs of multilingual students across campus, and the faculty who teach them.*

In the introductory chapter of *WAC for the New Millennium*, McLeod and Miraglia (2001) present a number of issues and questions related to the staying power and evolutionary potential of WAC programs given multiple nationwide changes affecting higher education throughout the US. Indeed, these questions are addressed with some degree of urgency given that they are presented in response to Walvoord's (1997, p. 70) call for WAC to "dive in or die" and to Haworth's (1997, p. A14) call for public institutions, in general, to become "architects

of change.” With resolution to endure and adapt, McLeod and Miraglia ask, “How will it grow and change – what new forms will WAC programs take, and how will they adapt some of the present program elements and structures to the changing scene in higher education?” (p. 4). One partial answer to McLeod and Miraglia’s question is for WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics faculty to cultivate purposeful, strategic program-building collaborations that clearly support institutional goals for campus internationalization. Specifically, an improved effort to build and showcase intentional alliances with other writing and language specialists on campus could lead to new forms and/or dimensions of WAC programs, fostering greater depth of current WAC structures and a greater range for WAC applications. Further, such strategic program-building collaborations within small, high-profile programs for heavily-recruited multilingual students may lead to the promotion of an integrated network of a team of experts who can advise the university on how best to address a wider scope of need among diverse populations of developing student writers across disciplines, L2 writers included.

While WAC strives to create and sustain a community of writing-pedagogy-minded faculty across the curriculum, formal collaboration with L2 writing and ESL/applied linguistics faculty can add depth and perspective to the WAC agenda with regard to institutional support for a wider range of student writers and the faculty who instruct them. This point resonates among WAC scholars (McLeod, 2008; Zawacki, 2010; Cox, 2011) as well as among L2 writing scholars, including Matsuda (2001). WAC leaders have recently signaled a shift in the profession, moving multilingual-writing-related issues from the periphery toward the center of conversation through reflections on the international and global-oriented WAC agenda. Presenting “The Future of WAC” plenary address at the Ninth International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference (IWAC), McLeod (2008), with regard to the Bologna Process<sup>1</sup> and its potential effects on transnational writers and their teachers, concluded,

This means that there will be—in fact, already is—a huge increase in the use of English as a lingua franca (if we may call it that) in the world, and an accompanying increase in the teaching of academic English as a second, sometimes a third or fourth language. Of course, students from other countries will bring with them not only linguistic but also cultural differences. What sort of institutional structures will be put in place to support these students and their teachers? How can our WAC experience in North America be helpful, and how can we learn from our international colleagues’ experience?

Further signaling a growing concern for a “writing pedagogy of inclusion” among WAC scholars in the field, Zawacki’s (2010) plenary address at the IWAC Conference urged greater collaboration among stakeholders and the development of a more complex, global-oriented, ESL-ready framework for WAC programs, suggesting that,

In comparison to our L2 students, we faculty have quite some distance to travel as we negotiate our expectations for the writing they do in our disciplines. In our negotiations—with student writers, with faculty, and with stakeholders inside and outside of our institutions—the question we need to ask is not “What is good-enough writing?” but rather “What is good writing as it mirrors the professional goals of our students, the work places they want to enter, and the variety of Englishes people are using there?” In the process, we may learn to hear and value the written accents our L2 students bring to our classrooms.

Certainly, given the context of these messages, McLeod’s and Zawacki’s recent attention to issues of transnationalism, internationalism, multilingualism, and L2 writing gives credence to the goal of locating and fostering sustainable models for a WAC platform that effectively anticipates diverse populations of multilingual writers. But how? What does a “pedagogy of inclusion” entail, pragmatically speaking? Is the emergence and evolution of such a pedagogy affected by the trend to internationalize in higher education? How do internationalization initiatives affect WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics programs (as well as their relationships with one another at the institutional level)? We note in regard to the latter a critique made by Leki (2003) in “A Challenge to Second Language Writing Professionals: Is Writing Overrated?” in which she draws attention to potential adverse outcomes resulting from heightened (and often mandated) institutional focus on student writing across the curriculum (e.g. writing proficiency testing, writing intensive courses). In “WAC: Closing Doors or Opening Doors for Second Language Writers?,” Cox (2011) investigated Leki’s claim by reviewing scholarship on the intersection of WAC and L2 writing, asking,

Is it possible that WAC administrators and scholars, like our colleagues in L2 writing studies and first year composition, place the same overemphasis on writing? Have we paid more attention to the potential benefits of integrating writing into curricula than the possible costs to some students? If we are

paying attention, what possible costs for L2 students should we be attending to?

In response, we point to language-supported internationalization initiatives such as the ACCESS program as interesting contexts for WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics faculty to consider as they look for innovative ways to construct a writing pedagogy of inclusion that opens doors for L2 writers.

Presenting an L2 writing perspective with regard to constructing an inclusive WAC approach, Matsuda (2001) concludes,

In order to provide adequate writing instruction for all students, including second-language writers, all WAC programs must become “ESL ready”; that is, everyone involved in WAC initiatives—including WAC administrators, writing consultants and writing fellows as well as faculty across the disciplines who use writing in their courses—needs to recognize the presence of second-language writers, to understand their characteristics and needs, and to prepare themselves for the challenge of addressing the needs of those students. To practice WAC, then, is to practice ESL. Yet, ultimately, second-language writers are not the only ones who benefit from the efforts to develop more inclusive WAC programs. Such efforts can, in the long run, contribute to the further democratization of US higher education for all kinds of students. (n.p.)

While we fully agree with Matsuda, we note that, even among those WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics faculty most keen to collaboratively construct an ESL-ready program, developing such a comprehensive WAC platform takes time, incentive, and funding. The questions are many (e.g., should collaboration take place at the committee or program level and in what form?), the task is particularly difficult (i.e., preparing faculty across the disciplines to confidently incorporate more meaningful writing in their classes *and* comfortably assume a more linguistically-complex set of students), and the incentive for ESL-ifying WAC may not be obvious to many or even most. Further, one must question the sustainability of collaborative efforts, given faculty/administrator turnover and institutional support (or lack thereof) for the ongoing maintenance, revision, and/or expansion of faculty development trainings, campus outreach, collaborative research projects, resource-development, etc. Still, the goal seems worth the challenge given the potential for making a positive impact across campus. But how and where to get started?

With these goals and questions in mind and in order to examine the conditions for implementing and sustaining a language-supported approach to internationalization and its potential contributions to the evolving notions of “ESL ready,” “pedagogy of inclusion,” and “the further democratization of US higher education for all kinds of students,” we focus in this chapter on one such initiative, the ACCESS program, which is a program for first-year international students as they enter discipline-specific and major courses, administered through the Center for International Student Access (CISA) at George Mason University. Our “ESL-ready” model – ACCESS – has been built with the goal of “opening doors” for the international students we recruit and the faculty from across the curriculum who participate in teaching the courses. While the goal of the research we conducted was primarily to address questions related to program effectiveness, the writing-related data we present are intended to showcase programmatic elements and potential research-guided implications for this writing-rich approach to internationalization in US higher education institutions.

We begin with a description of the ACCESS model focusing in particular on tangible ways in which WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics specialists have collaborated. Then we turn to a description of our research methods and findings, which we have organized according to the benefits of this collaborative approach for students and faculty as well as areas where improvements need to be made. In describing the ACCESS model and our writing-related data, we aim to address two wider questions: 1) What role does/might WAC play in an ESL-ready program model for language-supported campus internationalization? And, echoing Cox (2011), 2) How does a language-supported approach to internationalization open doors for participating faculty and L2 writers that WAC institutionalized practices may have inadvertently closed in the past? Finally, by showcasing features of and research on the ACCESS model – a program for heavily-recruited international students<sup>2</sup> for which much institutional energy has been invested –we argue for the institutional support systems needed in order for these and other populations of multilingual students to succeed.

## **LANGUAGE-SUPPORTED INTERNATIONALIZATION: A CENTER-BASED MODEL FOR ESL-READY PROGRAMS**

While the recent trend in US higher education has been campus internationalization, institutions have differed in their approach: some internationalization initiatives tend to favor a more de-centralized, bottom-up approach whereas others are designed to be more centralized, often implemented

from the top down. CISA, formed in 2010, partially in response to George Mason University's own established goals for campus internationalization<sup>3</sup>, was formed by and is directed out of the Provost Office. Although CISA is certainly administered as a centralized, top-down program, its reliance on existing faculty and departmental/program structures has fostered an on-the-ground, bottom-up spirit in many ways. CISA is unique in its approach and structure, and such particularities are important to consider in light of their potential effects on language and writing support/development for the international students who participated in this study. Further, such programmatic elements are important for WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/Applied Linguistic specialists to consider if potential implications from this study are to inform collaborations and/or program development at other US universities; for, while the CISA model is built upon the foundation of available resources and collaborations particular to George Mason, it is possible to establish (or begin strategically planning to establish) effective models that are built upon substitutable institution-specific resources elsewhere. To understand our model, such macro-level conditions for successful language-supported internationalization need to be made clear here.

First, rather than partnering with an outside, for-profit company that promised to recruit and provide language and academic content instruction to 700+ new international students per year, CISA is the result of a home-grown initiative (i.e. a "do it yourself" model). At its inception, a new CISA directorship position was created and filled by a candidate with strong prior administrative leadership experience and vision for realistic and thoughtful campus internationalization. In addition, CISA, along with the university's English Language Institute (ELI), an intensive-English program, signed an institutional memorandum of understanding<sup>4</sup> which outlined a joint partnership for administering and staffing two language-supported programs for two targeted international student populations: the ACCESS program for academically-qualified<sup>5</sup> undergraduate students scoring below the direct admission English language proficiency requirement<sup>6</sup> and the BRIDGE-English Enrichment Track (BRIDGE-EET) program for academically-qualified graduate students scoring below program-determined English language proficiency requirements. The writing-related research reported here is focused exclusively on data collected from faculty and students involved with the ACCESS program in order to more narrowly consider issues particular to undergraduate L2 writing/writers and the faculty who teach them.

Second, on the macro-level, the conditions for effective, collaboratively-constructed internationalization at Mason have been fostered by a process of pooling campus resources and soliciting input from language- and writing-focused specialists across campus. For example, significant contributions with

regard to ACCESS program structure and course sequencing were made by the director of the Mason WAC program, the director of the composition program, and the assistant director for language development for the ELI/CISA. Additionally, and of particular significance, these three programs came together to develop a new course design and curriculum outline for a year-long composition course (English 121/122) developed to meet the writing and language needs of incoming ACCESS students, and co-taught by composition and ELI faculty.

A third distinguishing feature of the ACCESS model is the program's novel approach to language-supported internationalization through curricular and instructional innovation. As a program that supports first-year students as they enter discipline-specific courses and courses in their majors, ACCESS students take a full-time academic course load (28 credits) toward a bachelor's degree during the year-long program (for a list of set ACCESS year courses, see Table 16.1). Depending on a variety of factors, one or two of the courses throughout the year are major courses while the others are general education courses or courses considered general electives in which students are enrolled by ACCESS cohort group. As outlined in Tables 16.1 and 16.2, ACCESS students receive varied forms of embedded, curricular language support in addition to full ACCESS to designated writing center tutors.

As is evident in Tables 16.1 and 16.2, from a language-acquisition standpoint, ACCESS students engage in a year-long program wherein they are asked to comprehend (e.g. listening and reading) and produce (e.g. speaking and writing) English in the context of academic study, providing natural content, contexts, and motivation for improved language proficiency and marked growth in content knowledge. For the students, writing is supported in content courses, in language-supported courses, and through significant use of the university writing center ESL-trained tutors. Further, student learning is central to the program, sustained by cross-course and cross-semester sequencing and alignment of language skill development and academic skill reinforcement, a shared responsibility among all involved faculty and undertaken through CISA orientations, monthly faculty meetings, course coordinator meetings, curriculum committee meetings, ongoing materials development project meetings, etc.

Beyond this sensible, strategic linking of academic and linguistic goals for student development, the ACCESS program also supports faculty development, relying on collaboration and input from language and writing specialists across campus. As is outlined in Table 16.3 in Appendix A, language and writing specialists on campus have been utilized as resources to help design, implement, and revise several structural and curricular components of the ACCESS program.

**Table 16.1 First Semester – CISA ACCESS Program<sup>7</sup>**

<b>Course</b>	<b>Credits<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>Abbreviated Description of Course and Language Support</b>
ENGH 121: Enhanced English Composition I	3*	General education course. Co-taught, year-long composition course for ACCESS students instructed by a rhetoric/composition faculty and ELI faculty. Course introduces students to the writing process, the conventions of academic writing, writing as a tool for developing critical thinking, and the research process through a specified course theme (e.g. the purpose of the university), focusing heavily on developing reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary-building strategies throughout the year. Both instructors are present in each class meeting and work closely together to plan assignments and lesson plans, develop materials and grading rubrics, provide feedback on student writing, and assign grades to student work.
UNIV 100: Fresh- man Transition to College I	1	General elective course. Transitional course for freshmen, focuses on introducing and developing academic skills (e.g. reading strategies, test-taking, study skills, etc.) and student development (e.g. time management, health, relationships, etc.).
COMM 100: Public Speaking	3*	General education course introducing students to various contexts and approaches to public speaking in the US. Class sessions are taught by communications faculty and supported by an ELI faculty member who attends each class session, shares in grading/feedback for students' written preparation and oral assignments, and teaches students in a language support course immediately following each communications class meeting.
PROV 103: Academic Language Support for Public Speaking	1	Language support course for ACCESS students which meets for 50 minutes following each COMM 100 class meeting and is taught by ELI faculty member. Course focuses on the development of those linguistic skills pertinent to upcoming assignments/speeches in COMM 100, differentiating instruction according to student ability/need.
PROV 106: Ameri- can Cultures	3*	General education course. Introduces students to anthropology through observations and analysis of American cultures. Course taught by anthropology faculty.
Math course (per placement exam)	3	General education course, determined by placement exam.



Appendix A provides an overview of some such tangible, collective efforts among CISA, ELI, WAC, and composition program faculty/staff in preparation and throughout the ACCESS pilot year. As is noted in Table 16.3 in Appendix A, several collaboration-focused, sustainable aspects of the ACCESS program have been incorporated into its overall structure, including joint course observations; faculty hiring, staffing, and evaluation tasks; faculty training/orientation; and faculty curriculum and advisory committees. Collectively, such tasks require that those language and writing specialists first involved with the theoretical construction of the ACCESS program stay involved as the program evolves

**Table 16.2 Second Semester –CISA ACCESS Program**

Course	Credits	Language-supported Aspects
ENGH 122: Enhanced English Composition II	3*	General education course. See description above. Second half of year-long course.
UNIV 100: Fresh- man Transition to College II	1	General elective course. See description above. Sec- ond half of year-long course.
HIST 125: World History	3*	General education course, introducing students to the field of history through the analysis of economic, cultural, and political evolution across various regions of the world. Class sessions are taught by history faculty and supported by an ELI faculty member who attends each class session, shares in grading/feed- back for students' written preparation, and teaches students in a language support course immediately following each World History class meeting.
PROV 104: Academic Language Support for World History	1	Language support course for ACCESS student which meets for 50 minutes following each HIST 125 class meeting and is taught by an ELI faculty member. Course focuses on the development of those linguistic skills pertinent to upcoming reading/writing as- signments in HIST 125, differentiating instruction according to student ability/need.
Research Methods	3*	General education course. Introduces students to the research process, focusing on question-based inquiry around a course theme (e.g. global hunger).
Major course	3	Major course, determined with advisor approval.

and grows. In addition, as enrollments in CISA programs increase, added or new faculty who teach for the Center are oriented to these sustainable practices in which they are engaged in discussions about language learning, writing instruction, and the multilingual experience. In short, the ACCESS model carries with it many aspects that WAC, ESL/applied linguistics, and L2-writing specialists might consider valuable in the construction of an operationalized ESL-ready program, through which an emerging pedagogy of inclusion is developed and distributed among faculty across the disciplines.

In a variety of ways, then, the ACCESS structure presents itself as a potential ESL-ready model through which academic faculty receive training on and experience with teaching multilingual students while ACCESS students benefit from particular programmatic and curricular innovations that have been tailored to the generalized academic, linguistic, and cultural needs of international students. Further, it should be noted that one significant aspect of the Center-based, centralized approach to language-supported internationalization is its potential for transfer as participating faculty take their pedagogical training and experience teaching multilingual students with them into future classrooms with other student populations. Finally, we note that the program has assumed responsibility for retaining ACCESS students at the university after program completion, therefore spurring conversations about additional and modified support structures that may be needed for these students in the near future. This next phase, we anticipate, will be a clear point at which we can all shift to discussions around writing-intensive courses and writing in the disciplines at the upper division of undergraduate education, with the needs of all L2 writers included.

## OUR STUDY

While the ACCESS program model seemed like a promising way to open doors for international students, there was certainly a need to gather quantitative and qualitative data from faculty and students involved in the 2010-2011 pilot year of the program in order to gauge actual student and faculty perspectives on program design and effectiveness in order to inform additional program development and revision. In response to these needs, we began conducting IRB-approved longitudinal research as we sought to answer our driving research question, “How do ACCESS students’ perceptions of their academic, linguistic, and cultural experiences compare with ACCESS-affiliated faculty perspectives on teaching multilingual students across the ACCESS-included disciplines?”

While drawing on this larger study, content for this chapter is focused on data that address writing instruction, including surveys, interviews, and analyses of samples of student writing and faculty feedback. Generally-speaking, the purpose of the overall research project was to gather a variety of data from participants in order to help us determine if the structures and resources that we had collaboratively put in place were perceived by both participant groups as helpful and why or why not. We also wanted to know if and how teaching in the ACCESS program was pedagogically challenging and/or rewarding for faculty and why or why not. Finally, in order to explore the potential for a stronger institutional link between the WAC program and language-supported internationalization on campus, we wanted to gather data that would help us address the two main questions we noted at the outset of the chapter regarding the role WAC might play in an ESL-ready program and how the programmatic approach described above might open doors for participating faculty and L2 writers that WAC may have inadvertently closed in the past.

## **PARTICIPANTS**

Participants for the student-focused study included 18 undergraduate students enrolled in the pilot year of the CISA ACCESS program at George Mason University, 91% of whom were classified as international students by the university. Of these, 70% were male, 59% hailed from a Gulf nation, and 70% spoke Arabic as a first language. Forty-eight percent had attended the ELI prior to matriculation into the ACCESS program. Thirty-five percent were interested in studying business, 25% engineering, and 10% global studies. The remaining participants were undeclared majors by the end of the ACCESS year.

Faculty participants included seven faculty members teaching courses in which ACCESS students were enrolled (i.e. courses were either ACCESS-exclusive, sheltered courses or open, lecture-style classes in which the ACCESS students were integrated among other enrolled freshmen). Faculty came from a range of academic disciplines, including history, communications, anthropology, higher education, English, and ESL. Three of the seven participants were English department<sup>9</sup> and ESL faculty; the remaining four faculty had no prior formal training in teaching multilingual writers. Each of the participating faculty members had elected to teach in the ACCESS program, which included faculty orientation and training on teaching L2 writers provided through CISA. Further, each of the participating faculty members had some form of prior cross-cultural experience (e.g. living/traveling overseas, studying abroad in college, participating in the Fulbright program in another country, etc.).

## **WRITING-RELATED DATA**

### **Surveys and Interviews**

The surveys generally had 8 to 12 questions and included multiple choice, ranked, and open-ended question types. The questions directed students to report on their perceptions of language usage, proficiency developments, cultural adjustments, relationships with domestic and other international students, written feedback from faculty, academic challenges, suggestions for program revisions, and engagement with writing and writing assignments. Questions asked of faculty focused on their perceptions of academic, linguistic, and cultural challenges faced by students; experiences teaching in the program generally; perceptions of student progress; reflections on their preparation to teach multilingual students; suggestions for revisions to the program; experiences with providing feedback on student work; etc. Interviews with faculty and students were semi-structured and consistent across all students per initial, mid-year, and final interviews. Faculty were only interviewed once toward the end of the program year. Interviews generally averaged 30-45 minutes each and were audio-recorded. All interviews were transcribed by either one of the co-researchers or our graduate research assistant. Survey data and transcribed interview data were coded by the co-researchers according to emerging, developing themes within a framework of larger questions with branching sub-questions. Some data were coded under multiple themes if relevant to multiple questions/sub-questions. Co-researchers worked together to code data thematically in the beginning stages of data analysis until normed at 93% consistent coding.

### **Samples of Student Writing and Teacher Feedback on Student Writing**

Three samples of student writing with teacher responses were collected from faculty throughout the year. Faculty were also asked to submit course syllabi, descriptions of major assignments, and grading rubrics. The writing samples were varied, including journal entries, essay- and short-answer-format midterm and final exams, reflection papers, language development portfolios, narrative essays, argumentative essays, and more.

### **Students' Entrance, Midyear, and Exit Language Proficiency Tests**

All students in the ACCESS program were required to take the same test—AccuPlacer© ESL—three times during the year. The proficiency test is

computer-based with listening, reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary sections. A separate oral interview was conducted by ELI faculty to gauge oral English proficiency. The test was self-paced and timed, administered by ELI faculty in a computer lab. Students had two hours to complete three sections of the test each time. All sections of the computer-based portions of the test were rated by AccuPlacer©, though ELI faculty also conducted a normed, human rating according to five dimensions for the writing component of the test.

## **DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

As is detailed in the ACCESS program description above, this writing-rich, language-supported approach to campus internationalization does not simply give lip service to the particular needs of L2 writers. Real-time language support is woven into the ACCESS program through curricular, pedagogical, and programmatic support structures in recognition of students' language learning goals. These realistic language-related goals are determined by language and writing specialists, including WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics specialists at the institution. Further, they are jointly communicated to the faculty and to the students. While there may certainly be locally-determined causes to forego real-time, in-class language support for multilingual students (e.g., expense, lack of ESL-trained faculty, lack of willingness among academic faculty to co-teach, etc.), data from this study support our claim that both faculty and students benefit from such an opportunity to address language-related issues as they arise. In short, participating in ACCESS allows all involved the opportunity to explore what it means to administer, teach, and learn in an emerging ESL-ready program. We are confident that the experience will foster the long-term vision for an ESL-ready campus that is supported in strategic ways by a team of writing specialists, including WAC, L2 writing, ESL/applied linguistics experts.

### **BENEFITS AND CHALLENGES FOR FACULTY TEACHING IN THE ACCESS PROGRAM**

As is evident in survey responses, interviews, and teacher feedback on student writing, academic faculty who participated in the ACCESS program learned about the value of language-supported internationalization, fostering new teaching practices that more fairly and realistically consider the needs of L2 writers; in short, we found that ACCESS faculty developed more thoughtful pedagogical

practices. Our goal is that they will carry the ACCESS experience forward as they teach mixed populations of students across the disciplines in the future.

In an early faculty survey, we asked about the roles writing played in their ACCESS courses. In response, faculty described varied purposes for assigning writing, e.g. writing to engage with content, to critique peers' written/oral work, to reflect on academic and cultural events/experiences, to engage in critical thinking, to develop research questions, to outline lecture/reading content, to develop written English accuracy at the sentence level, and to develop well-structured and supported positions. In response to a question about their expectations for student writing, faculty generally stated that they expected students to make clear, cohesive, and relevant arguments; use evidence to support their claims; and demonstrate marked improvements in both English fluency and accuracy throughout the ACCESS year. Interestingly but not surprisingly, composition and language support faculty responses tended to include additional more general expectations for students as developing writers beyond their ACCESS courses that highlighted their concern that the writing skills they were teaching would transfer beyond the ACCESS year as well as their sense of accountability for such transfer, e.g. "I need to prepare them for writing next year." Asking faculty to articulate the importance and purposes for writing in their courses was a meaningful exercise because it also opened the door to more in-depth reflections on their approaches to writing pedagogy throughout the year.

One important element of that approach, according to our interview data, was the role played by the language-support instructors; namely, academic content faculty noted the relief they felt in being able to defer (at least early on) to the language specialists to address ACCESS students' language development goals/challenges directly. ELI faculty appreciated the opportunity to plan and deliver authentic content-based instruction in coordination with a content-area expert. Because we found that during the pilot year content-area faculty may have marked but not attempted to explain grammar errors, the following year we introduced them to different approaches to corrective written feedback and error treatment with the goal of helping them approach language-related issues with a set of approved, research-backed feedback methods. When asked to report on the most effective forms of collaboration among ACCESS faculty, 83% of faculty said that they communicated regularly with one another outside of class about course-related issues, 33% of academic and language support faculty reported that they co-planned daily lesson plans, and 16% of academic and language support faculty reported that they communicated with one another about specific students/student issues on a weekly basis.

While the option of language-supported content instruction for multilingual students is not available outside of the ACCESS program, we suspect and hope that the varied forms of collaboration among language-support and academic faculty that took place during the ACCESS year may encourage academic faculty to modify their approaches to teaching in the future in order to accommodate their new, heightened awareness of the needs of multilingual students across the curriculum. Although we do not have hard data to support this assumption at this point in our study, participating faculty reflections toward the end of the ACCESS year suggest that revisions to their general pedagogical approach are affected by the ACCESS teaching experience. For example, the participating ACCESS faculty member teaching the world history course reflected on ACCESS student progress and the degree to which his own pedagogical approach and course requirements may have affected student progress:

Well, again, ultimately the most challenging aspect was that a few kids just didn't improve as much as I would have liked them to. I mean, most of them did, really, so I wasn't despairing, but I had the sense most of them were working pretty hard. I can't prove that about all of them, but I'm sure some of them must be a little frustrated. I mean, I think a history course in the first semester of this program is by definition very challenging because it's a lot of reading and it's a fair amount of writing...I think it's difficult for all concerned. And when a few students just don't quite break the barriers that you could see were there when they first started...you feel sad...you think, "Could I have done better with this?"

Similarly, the composition instructor reflected on collaboration with language-support faculty and her own pedagogical approach throughout the ACCESS program as she considered future applications:

I realize that I haven't really adapted my pedagogy for a while, like I've been teaching the same kind of people, groups of people.... Anyway, I was just reflecting the other day on my own teaching and I see how I can strengthen it in general, not only for international students...just in general how I can better balance rhetorical skills with language proficiency. I've never ever known how to do that. I've always been sort of

like ignorant of the language thing and what helped students with that.... But now I realized like “I know how to do that. I’ve learned how I can merge the two more effectively.”

In addition, the ELI language support faculty member, who provided support for the oral communication course, offered this reflection:

...I think [teaching in the ACCESS program) is also good for instructors. You have a number of instructors who maybe came from different environments where there wasn’t that kind of international mix. So they come in, I think, with certain assumptions about what students will understand and how they will interact with the curriculum. And that gets changed when you bring in different perspectives from different students. So I think it’s very healthy for them as well – makes all of us better teachers.

As is evidenced in these quotes from participating pilot-year instructors, one faculty-oriented benefit of the ACCESS program is that it opens doors for faculty to reflect on pedagogical practices in a way that more accurately accounts for the presence of L2 writers in courses across the disciplines. Further, due to the on-scene presence of language-support faculty, the ACCESS model appears to provide a structure by which academic faculty can feel supported themselves as they explore and experience what it takes to teach a more linguistically and culturally diverse set of students.

While more could be said about the curricular and pedagogical adjustments and revisions made by faculty throughout the year, we would like to mention that 100% of participating ACCESS faculty reported that they decided to make significant pedagogical adjustments throughout the year in order to teach the ACCESS students. Specifically, 66.6% of participating faculty reported in surveys that they modified their teaching methods in order to better fit the ACCESS group needs by making one or more of the following adjustments: providing students with more sample work; providing students with more outlines; slowing down the pace of the course; and providing students with more foundational skills in advance of a particular content lesson. In addition, ACCESS faculty reported other forms of pedagogical adjustments during final interviews, such as more thoroughly explaining assignment components and deliverables and introducing students to culture-based knowledge/resources needed to appropriately address assignments/projects. (For more examples of the ways in which faculty across the curriculum make adjustments to writing



pedagogy for L2 students, see Hirsh, Nielsen, and Ives et al. (this volume). For advice for creating linguistically and culturally inclusive pedagogy, see Cox (this volume). One hundred percent reported a desire to teach in the program again the following year and described ways they planned to adjust their teaching, even though, as the world history professor said,

Frankly [teaching in ACCESS] was more work than I'm used to. I don't mind that, but that's the difficult part. I mean, I had more students turning in drafts of papers. I've always had a policy where students could turn in drafts, but frankly, American students turn in maybe 10%. But these kids, some of these kids were turning in three or four drafts each. I was [also] trying to put more into the organizational clarity of the course, and it was work. I think it was good for me to have that, so I'm not complaining, but it was work.

One additional challenge ACCESS faculty encountered with regard to teaching with writing had to do with providing feedback on ACCESS student written work, particularly sentence-level feedback. When asked about the importance of grammatical accuracy for success in their course on the week 8 survey, 66.7% of faculty said that accuracy was “very important,” 16.7% said “important” and 16.7% said “somewhat important.” (For more on faculty perspectives on sentence-level differences in L2 student writing, see Zawacki & Habib and Ives et al. [this volume].) As we could see in their feedback on student papers, however, they clearly struggled throughout the year with how best to address grammatical accuracy in order to help student writers improve. Some teachers, for example, provided direct correction (i.e. words crossed out and “correct” words written in by the teacher) so that students could see/correct the errors in their writing; some left all sentence-level feedback to the language-support instructors and focused exclusively on the students' ability to engage the course content; some tried different methods throughout the term, sometimes calling attention to grammar errors and other times ignoring them. In interviews, most acknowledged some unease with regard to addressing grammar issues. For example, the freshman transition instructor, who has a background in music and higher education, told us,

And so when I gave an assignment and the students wrote something, I said [to myself], “Oh, well I need to judge this for their thinking rather than how they're writing it.” So that was a big adjustment for me and I found myself, like, getting

together with grammar books and making sure I was trying to review the correct markings...and I really struggled with this idea of, you know, ... that this class is about really just being thoughtful and applying what you're learning and more experiential stuff. So I didn't want to cross their thinking by making lots of edits on their papers, but I felt like they needed that because they're still working on [accuracy].

Notably, however, grammar did not seem to be a focus in teachers' end comments on papers. Nearly all of the end comments we analyzed addressed issues related to the content, organization, development, or support of ideas throughout the students' writing. Even when faculty opted to provide feedback in one form on sentence-level errors in the text, end comments were overwhelmingly positive and encouraging, offering praise, even if mixed, to the student for demonstrating specific signs of good academic writing, e.g. from the world history teacher: "...you have a clear conclusion [although] your evidence points in several directions..." and, for another student, "...not bad. Good data. The main problem is you don't quite take a position on the question as to whether [they are the] same civilization or not."

Although faculty tended to downplay grammar in their feedback on student papers, in the week eight survey, 83.3% requested additional professional development in the form of a workshop on providing effective feedback on student written work. Thus, it may be the case that some participating faculty wanted to provide more thorough sentence-level feedback and hold students accountable for grammatical accuracy as the semester(s) progressed, but felt unsure of their own ability to guide this aspect of student writing, especially given the fact that faculty were also aware of the researchers' interest in L2 writing issues. In response to this request, faculty *and* student orientations were modified the following year to include more information and practice on giving/interpreting sentence-level teacher feedback on student writing.

## **BENEFITS TO ACCESS STUDENTS OF A LANGUAGE-SUPPORTED PROGRAM**

ACCESS students also clearly benefited from and recognized the value of the innovative curricular and pedagogical approaches to language-supported content instruction. As we'll show, they also demonstrated marked language proficiency growth as an outcome. In response to survey and interview questions about their feelings of satisfaction with the ACCESS program, many students noted that they felt particularly satisfied with instruction that was provided through collaborative faculty efforts. When asked for suggestions for program

revisions, 26.7% of students recommended adding longer language support class meetings while 33% requested that more team-taught classes be made available for future ACCESS years. Some student comments included:

It seems very good and I learned a lot from the passing few weeks!! I really can see that the ACCESS program doing good for us.

What I cherish the most about the [language-support] class is the writing process, not just the grammar part, it's the writing. [The instructor] really helps me develop my writing skills; like, not in a way just how to write, but how to write to think, how to be a good thinker to be a better writer. You know what I mean? Yeah, so I like that we get both.

I feel that all of our teachers are doing a great job in explaining to us the subjects and taking the time to see if we understand more and if we need any help. I think if the support classes were still on next semester as well it will be much better, though.

These comments were further reflected in the data from the participating students' exit interviews in which they were asked to consider how they might have done had they been directly admitted rather than going through the ACCESS program. Their responses reflect an awareness of how the program structure helped them to be successful as they entered discipline-specific and major courses:

Education wise, I would've been, I guess I can say, a little bit lost, because I got a lot of support here and I like it. It makes me feel safe, maybe, and I think I am now ready to go, on my own...I guess.

I'm a whole different person right now .... Something changed me here. I just, I really changed here, this year. I've become, like, I work harder. I just think ... more honestly and do things more, not just honestly, but just from the bottom-up. I write what I think is right. At home, I just write things because I have to do it. A lot of things have changed me here, but something has to do with writing.

Further, the positive impact of embedded language support on ACCESS students was evident in the students' overall growth in language proficiency by the end of the year<sup>10</sup>. Put simply, a basic concern for the pilot year group of ACCESS students was whether or not the program structure and language-support elements would “work” in terms of providing an environment in which students' English language proficiency would improve. The results of standardized assessments of student English language proficiency were combined with a Language Acquisition Portfolio project that students constructed during the year-long English composition course<sup>11</sup>. These language-focused data points were added to an overall, individual student profile that included student performance in all ACCESS/major courses and a student-developed portfolio. Taken together, the data show that all students made significant progress, moving from an average “intermediate” level of language proficiency to an average outgoing “low-advanced” level of language proficiency, according to a scale we developed to streamline ELI placements and set entrance scores for CISA<sup>12</sup>. Thus, with regard to student progress, these progress results were in line with our program expectations for general and writing proficiency growth and were deemed realistic goals given the context and time for language learning. Generally, students in the pilot year said they felt satisfied with their overall progress but somewhat frustrated with the pace of such progress, as might be expected. With regard to program design and built-in language policies, these results were significant because they supported our pilot year hypothesis that “low advanced” language proficiency would be an achievable, realistic goal for student language development.

## **DATA-DRIVEN PROGRAMMATIC REVISIONS**

While the ACCESS program structure certainly resulted in many positive outcomes for participating faculty and students, pilot-year data from this study helped to identify several programmatic features in need of further development. Generally-speaking, research data contributed to discussions around the need for program-wide quality control as ACCESS transitioned from pilot-year program creation/launch to later phases of program revision/expansion. Specifically, in order to strengthen and sustain the quality of ACCESS during this transitional time, a three-pronged approach to program sustainability was suggested and established: faculty development, materials development, and curriculum alignment.<sup>13</sup> Further, the program director made the decision to revise the program structure by creating “course coordinator” positions for lead faculty who have taken on the responsibility of ensuring cross-section and cross-

course curriculum alignment. In addition, themes that emerged from the data were converted by the researchers into data-driven discussion questions and were presented to all pilot-year ACCESS faculty and consultants (including the WAC director and composition director) at the end-of-the-year program retreat.

The first revision for ACCESS faculty development was to integrate opportunities for faculty to reflect on the importance and purpose of writing in their courses as well as the ways in which they might make their expectations for student writing more transparent to students in their assignments, rubrics<sup>14</sup>, and use of models. It was clear from the student-generated and faculty-generated data that both groups would benefit from opportunities to clarify faculty expectations for ACCESS student writing. On the one hand, students repeatedly expressed confusion over academic faculty expectations for student writing. An example of such confusion is evident in one student's interview reflection as she tries to explain her awareness that faculty have different expectations, and that, in some way she still can't quite articulate, these change the way she's supposed to structure her writing:

Like the writing, Oh my gosh, [the English course] has developed my writing a lot because I knew before that I could deliver an idea, but not in the way that my [other] different teachers had expected. Like, ... if you have the river and there are stones you have to put down so the reader could jump across the river, then ... my ideas are like the stones and I develop them, but it's like I need to know from my [other] teachers where the river is going. I need to move the stones so that the water can go through smoothly like the teacher expects, and the reader can still jump across my ideas.

When student participants were asked to explain why faculty expectations might differ across the various ACCESS courses (i.e. why rubrics and feedback might differ, depending on the course), they had nearly nothing to say. In fact, they generally laughed when asked in the interview to think aloud about possible reasons for differing faculty expectations of student writing and when asked the same question in a student survey, text boxes were either left blank or filled in with a question mark (e.g. "?"). Such data suggest that students had a developing sense that faculty expectations certainly differed across courses, but that there was no clear sense of how or why such differences existed. This finding aligns with other studies in the fields of WAC (Thaiss & Zawacki, 2006) and L2 writing (Gentil, 2011), supporting the recommendation that faculty can and

should purposefully guide students' early awareness of differing purposes and expectations for student writing across disciplines.

In response to these data, the second revision to ACCESS faculty development has been to suggest that faculty expectations for student writing (including an explanation of why/how those expectations are determined by the discipline, the department, or the individual instructor) be made more transparent to students. In short, we want to encourage ACCESS faculty to see that helping students identify and meet these differing expectations is the responsibility of both the disciplinary faculty and the composition/language support faculty, not just the latter. By taking time during the faculty training sessions to have these types of conversations around discipline, department, and/or individual expectations for student writing – those that are different and those that are similar – we hope that faculty will clarify for themselves the particularities of their expectations. Further, we hope that these new understandings will transform participating faculty's approach to teaching with writing both in and beyond the ACCESS program and, as a result, will help students to transfer both writing skills and an awareness of disciplinary differences when they write in and beyond the language-supported ACCESS courses across the disciplines.

Finally, the third revision made to the ACCESS faculty development has been to include a workshop session on providing sentence-level feedback to student writing, primarily through corrective written feedback (Ferris, 2009) and the use of a coded error feedback chart. In short, just as we wanted all faculty across the disciplines to feel that they were responsible for communicating their expectations for student writing, we also wanted faculty to develop some strategies for sentence-level feedback given that they had, in fact, identified grammatical accuracy as an important feature for successful completion of the course.

Together, these three revisions allow the opportunity for participating faculty to explore the realities, complexities, and opportunities of language-supported internationalization and teaching with writing. While our plan is to follow these faculty throughout the coming years to determine if/how they apply what they have learned through the ACCESS teaching experience to other teaching contexts at Mason, we anticipate that this experience and these resources will affect their overall approach to teaching, writing pedagogy included.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the ACCESS model programmatic elements described above, we believe that our university is emerging as a leading institution for a center-based, language-supported approach to campus internationalization. While

CISA is in no way a perfect program, we see potential for sensible, realistic program growth and sustainability. Further, for the architects of the ACCESS model, it has been an interesting exercise in the practical application of cross-field theories. Whether we are WAC, L2 writing, ESL/applied linguistics, or other participating academics, we all want to provide a worthy education for these students through a positively-oriented plan for internationalization. We want both faculty and students to feel supported and guided by best practices for the teaching and learning of writing. Yet, no guidebook for collaboratively constructing a successful ESL-ready model that incorporates the best of what we know as WAC, L2 writing, and ESL/applied linguistics professionals exists. As a result, we have had to be creative and patient. We have also had to set aside some disciplinary divisions in order to focus on co-building something new.

In relatively recent years, some have argued that the national WAC-driven push for institution-wide integration of writing into the curriculum has generally cost L2 writers a great deal simply because there have not been enough language-support structures in place to aid in the proficiency development of such writers. If multilingual students are not provided the resources and support needed to improve language proficiency while WAC is encouraging more and more intensive integration of writing throughout the curriculum, the problem for L2 writers is obvious. However, based on the ACCESS model program design and the pilot year ACCESS program data, we believe that language-supported approaches to internationalization can help level the playing field for L2 writers, introducing students to language and writing resources and strategies and preparing them to effectively engage in writing across the curriculum once they leave our program.

In the end, by working together on these smaller programs designed specifically for recruited multilingual students who generally pay high tuitions and for whom the university is strategically invested, there is potential to establish a well-connected team of writing experts and an ESL-ready model program structure that is comprehensive, realistic, and transferrable to other contexts across the university. Further, the institutional energy that goes into developing these programs should open the door to wider conversations about the language and writing needs of multilingual students across campus.

## NOTES

1. The Bologna Process is generally known for standards-focused reform among European nations, the results of which have had a major impact on EU higher education systems with regard to university administration, comparability/transferability of credits/degrees, and higher education qualifications.

2. Primarily F1 Visa holders at the undergraduate and graduate levels who do not consider English the primary language of communication. To be clear, the authors purposefully aim to highlight the fact that these students are pursued by university admissions.

3. “The University will develop more fully its leading role as a global university.... [It will] expand the number of international students by at least 20% while improving the integration of international and domestic students in extracurricular as well as academic activities.” - *George Mason’s 2014 Strategic Plan, Goal 5*

4. This partnership between CISA and the ELI has meant that language instruction has not been outsourced, but rather, it has been built upon the foundation of an IEP that has been part of the university for the past 30 years. This aspect of the program is noteworthy because the local partnership – which carries less of a personnel risk for the university – is considered simple inter-departmental collaboration rather than an internal/external merger of sorts; further, both responsible parties have been able to comfortably assume of each other a fair degree of sensitivity to and familiarity with the institutional culture in general, and with potential complexities tied to campus internationalization in particular.

5. Students are deemed academically-qualified by the Office of Admissions upon review of applicants’ high school transcripts (translated and evaluated by outside companies, if needed) and SAT test scores. Admission requirements for ACCESS students are in line with general admission requirements for all applicants to the university.

6. ACCESS students come into the program with an overall score of B1 on the Common European Language Reference (CEFR) scale and Bridge-EET students come into the program with an overall score at the B1 or B1+ level (depending on differing graduate program requirements). A thorough discussion of language assessment measures and scales is beyond the scope of this paper; suffice it to say that ACCESS students generally enter the program with intermediate-level overall language proficiency whereas students who enter the university via direct admission typically demonstrate low-advanced language proficiency at minimum.

7. ACCESS courses that are tied to language support are shaded in order to distinguish them from the ACCESS courses that are part of the program but not directly linked to language support/instruction.

8. Courses for which students receive general education credits are marked in this column with an asterisk(\*).

9. Of significance, the participating English faculty member also taught the stretched composition course, English 121/122 , and is the former director of



the university writing center where she had created an “opt-in” program specifically designed for L2 writers. This instructor came to the program having done prior research with the director of the WAC program on multilingual writers’ experiences writing across the curriculum and in the disciplines. Finally, she herself is a multilingual writer.

10. Similar growth in overall language proficiency was demonstrated during the second year of the program as well.

11. Additionally, students were provided language reports and consultations with ELI faculty following each language assessment in order to clarify program expectations for language development and to supplement students’ strategies for language learning if need be.

12. We aligned the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) with commercial language proficiency testing measurements (e.g. TOEFL, IELTS, PTE, etc.) for the purpose of streamlining admissions/placement decisions around English language proficiency at the ELI and CISA. Generally-speaking, students coming into ACCESS needed to demonstrate a B1, intermediate proficiency, on this scale while students successfully completing the program needed to demonstrate a B2, low-advanced, proficiency. Due to length restrictions for this chapter, we are unable to go into detail with regard to these assessments/measures; however, the authors can be contacted for additional information on this topic.

13. Faculty development and materials development were prioritized as year-two areas of focus while curriculum alignment was identified as a year-three priority.

14. Interestingly, we found that even when faculty provided rubrics along with their assignments, students needed help understanding how to use the rubric in to address the assignment effectively.

## REFERENCES

- Cox, M. (2011, December 21). WAC: Closing doors or opening doors for second language writers? *Across the Disciplines*, 8(4). Retrieved August 17, 2012, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/cox.cfm>
- Ferris, D. R. (2009). *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. NY: Routledge.
- Gentil, G. (2011). A biliteracy agenda for genre research. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 20, 6-23.
- Haworth, K. (1997, April). Report urges colleges to inspire students and improve teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, A14.

- Leki, I. (2003). A challenge to second language writing professionals: Is writing overrated? In Barbara Kroll (Ed.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp. 315-332). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Matsuda, P. K. (2001). Opening statement: Academic Writing forum: Connecting WAC and ESL? *Academic Writing, 2*. Retrieved August 29, 2012, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/aw/forums/fall2001/>
- McLeod, S., & Miraglia, E. (2001). Writing across the curriculum in a time of change. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing writing-across-the-curriculum programs* (pp. 1-27). Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- McLeod, S. H. (2008). The future of WAC - Plenary Address, Ninth International Writing Across the Curriculum Conference, May 2008 (Austin, Texas). *Across the Disciplines, 5*. Retrieved August 28, 2012, from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/articles/mcleod2008.cfm>
- Thaiss, C. & Zawacki, T. M. (2006). *Engaged writers and dynamic disciplines: Research on the academic writing life*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Walvoord, B. E. F. (1997). *In the long run: A study of faculty in three writing-across-the-curriculum programs*. Urbana, IL: NCTE.
- Zawacki, T. M. (2010). Researching the local/writing the international: Developing culturally inclusive WAC programs and practices. Plenary talk at IWAC 2010, Bloomington, IN. Retrieved from <http://www.iub.edu/~wac2010/zawacki.shtml>

## APPENDIX

**Table 16.3: WAC, L2 Writing, and ESL/Applied Linguistics collaborative tasks**

Task	CISA Director & Staff	ELI/CISA <sup>A</sup>	WAC Director	English Composition Program
Providing students with a wide variety of co-curricular, extra-curricular, and complementary programming, including ACCESS-specific student and faculty orientations, Peer Learning Partners, academic advisors, cultural excursions, Living Learning Community activities, etc.	√	√		√

Task	CISA Director & Staff	ELI/ CISA <sup>A</sup>	WAC Director	English Composition Program
Development of new content-based English for Academic Purposes (EAP) curricula/materials to support two general education courses (PROV 104 to support World History and PROV 103 to support Public Speaking) specifically for ACCESS students.		√		
Development and revisions of co-taught, stretched, and enhanced English 121-122 specifically for ACCESS students.		√	√	√
Hiring, staffing, and observations of all ACCESS faculty.*	√	√	√	√
Conducting training sessions for CISA faculty across the disciplines on approaches to written feedback on multilingual writers' work.	√	√		√
Assessing and reporting on language proficiency (initial, midyear, and exit) for all enrolled ACCESS students.		√		
CISA Faculty Committees to determine and revise program-wide academic and language policies as well as major curricular and programmatic changes (e.g., Curriculum Committee, Language Acquisition Committee, Advisory Committee, etc.).	√	√	√	√

<sup>A</sup> Assistant Director for Language Development & ELI Language Support Course Faculty

<sup>B</sup> Director & English Faculty Teaching CISA Courses