"Commanding English," a three-quarter program of communication skills courses presented in an integrated whole, is described in this booklet. The program's general purpose is to assist students whose native language is not English to develop fluency in oral and written English. A brief description of each course offered at General College, University of Minnesota, is provided. The first semester courses deal with the following: vocabulary improvement; improving reading, comprehension, and study skills; improving spelling and punctuation; writing grammatical sentences and organizing paragraphs; and interpersonal communication. The various options offered the students who completed these courses are discussed and a description of the other courses in the following semester is given. These courses were on vocabulary improvement; reading comprehension and study skills; spelling, punctuation, writing sentences and paragraphs; and oral communication. The second year courses are also described. These courses were on group process and leadership; usage and style; a writing laboratory; and independent study courses. The report concludes with a description of the course offerings as they were modified in a subsequent semester and a discussion of the curriculum development and outcomes. (AMH)
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Commanding English (CE) is a three-quarter program of communicating skills courses packaged into an integrated whole. Its purpose is to assist students whose native language is not English in developing their fluency in oral and written English and their speed and comprehension in reading English to a level sufficient to enable them to pursue the course of study of their choice; to enable them, in other words, to function as competently as native speakers in their educational pursuits.

During fall, 1980, two sections of the first quarter of the Commanding English program (CE I) were offered. Students, all of whom were of Southeast Asian origin, were required to take all of the courses in the program. Each section of the program included the following courses: "Vocabulary Development," "Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills," "Improving Spelling and Punctuation," "Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs," and "Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication." In addition, the students had the options of enrolling in a "Support Seminar," designed to acclimate them to the University, and of attending a weekly "Orientation" session with the coordinator and staff of the program, the purpose of which was to allow them a time to discuss freely with their instructors their concerns about the program, the University, and the community.

The work of the courses was carefully integrated within the program. Students, for example, prepared writing assignments on topics related to their readings, videotaping exercises, and discussion topics in the other courses. Still, each course met separately in a classroom with an individual instructor, except for the writing skills courses which were offered through individual tutorial instruction in the Reading/Writing Skills Center.

Following is a brief analysis of each course as offered in Commanding English I, in fall, 1980.

**COMMANDING ENGLISH I (CE I).**

GC 1401, "Vocabulary Improvement".

The goal of this course was to work with vocabulary in context—as it related to the students' other courses—and to teach the students how to increase their vocabulary on their own through word analysis. Margaret Larson was the instructor in both sections of the course. Her first consideration was to teach the students proper use of the dictionary since non-native speakers of English often rely too heavily on dictionary inter-
interpretation of words. From that time on, students were encouraged to develop vocabulary without such heavy reliance on their use of the dictionary. They worked on developing vocabulary by using context clues for meaning and by deciding word meanings through the analysis of word parts—prefixes, suffixes, and roots. Additional time was spent focusing on the vocabulary and structures used in students' other classes or related to their career interests in mathematics and science. Finally, one portion of each week's work was devoted to a discussion of any new vocabulary, idioms, or special expressions encountered by the students during the week. Students also incorporated these words and phrases into extemporaneous paragraph writing. By the end of the quarter, students were putting previously unknown, difficult vocabulary into the context of a sentence and using the clues from context and word analysis effectively enough to fully understand a sentence or paragraph without interrupting their reading to use the dictionary.

GC 1402, "Improving Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills"

There were four sections of this course, two sections in each section of the program. Elisabeth Rosenberg was the instructor of two sections, and Margaret Larson was the instructor of the other two.

Rosenberg's approach was to focus on four related skills: 1) improving the students' reading speeds and habits; 2) improving their vocabulary; 3) developing their ability to summarize in writing what they had read; and 4) developing their study skills, particularly through underlining exercises with different types of college reading materials. Students read two to four essays out of class each week at their own speeds and used the reading machines for controlled reading in class twice each week, about half the class time. They improved their vocabularies by homework exercises and through weekly exercises in placing words into sentence contexts. In addition, one class each week was devoted to vocabulary and reading exercises from their homework. Students wrote weekly summaries of one of their readings, which were corrected and discussed individually before they rewrote them. In addition to study skills underlining exercises, students spent time discussing other study and test-taking techniques.

Larson's approach was relatively similar to Rosenberg's. Students worked on two out-of-class readings weekly, for which they timed their reading speed and completed comprehension and vocabulary exercises. Students also wrote summaries of each chapter of the course reader, which were corrected and rewritten. Part of the class time was devoted to controlled reading which emphasized improving reading rates while maintaining equal or improved comprehension, and part was devoted to free reading in which the students read novels they had chosen at the beginning of the quarter. The restrictions of time did not allow for much emphasis on study skills. Students gained a minimum of 100 words per minute in reading speed without decreasing in comprehension.

Both instructors were pleased with the text, American Topics, which was an effective introduction to several aspects of American culture, and both felt the size of the classes (a control of 15) and the use of a course assistant to be important additions to the effectiveness of their courses.
GC 1403, "Improving Spelling and Punctuation," and GC 1404, "Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs"

These two courses were offered as "individual instruction" courses, with arranged hours in the Reading/Writing Skills Center. Maureen Messer coordinated the assignments and activities of both sections of the courses and met with the student in progress conferences. Most of the instruction was presented by undergraduate teaching assistants (tutors in the Skills Center) on a self-paced basis.

Three main areas of skill development were emphasized in the scope of these courses: directed sentence and paragraph writing; basic grammar usage, and punctuation presented on an individual basis through the course text, Basic Grammar and Usage; and spelling improvement.

Messer designed weekly writing assignments in consultation with other instructors in the program. Emphasis was put on choosing topics which reinforced discussion of materials and techniques from other classes and on developing fluency. Students had no problems with writer's block; they wrote profusely on every topic. Many students showed flashes of insight or humor, and their writing skills, especially for those students with the weakest entry level writing skills, improved greatly. The writing practice was loosely coordinated with the use of Basic Grammar and Usage increasingly as the quarter went on. Students reviewed concepts of grammar, usage, and punctuation in an individual program, developed as a result of their work on a pretest. The text was a good introduction to the kind of handbook used by native speakers, though some of the students would have benefited from more comprehensive work on verb tenses, articles, and punctuation. Students had no real difficulty with spelling, and it is possible that greater work in the areas noted above could be substituted for the spelling portion of the program. The Skills Center atmosphere allowed them to work at their own pace, to converse with native speakers who were students at the University, and to get assistance in the areas in which they had greatest need.

GC 1465, "Interpersonal Communication"

The instructor of both sections of this course, Evelyn Hansen, attempted to achieve a balance between theoretical and applied concepts of communication. Students were expected to read and be able to discuss assigned chapters from the textbook, Monologue to Dialogue, and to write and submit answers to questions about those chapters from Hansen's Study Guide to Monologue to Dialogue. They were also given a total of three essay examinations covering the content of those assigned readings and discussion sessions. Keyed to the content of the assigned chapters were a set of five oral assignments which students presented to the audience of their fellow students while being videotaped. As a final project, the students were required to review all five of their videotapes and analyze them for evidence of self-growth and improved command of English and its idiomatic and vernacular use. Students, asked to comment frankly about the value of videotaping (given that it is an expensive and time-consuming process)
Conclusions and Comments

The fall offering of Commanding English was successful from several standpoints. Students grew measurably and visibly in their language skills. Data verifying this conclusion are appended to this report.

Students were also happy with their progress; continuation of Commanding English II (the second quarter of the sequence), though not required, was high, and students were eagerly asking about the final stages of the program offered in spring, 1981. Their recognition of their language skill needs and growth was reflected by their attitudes in the winter quarter program and by the attitudes of new Commanding English students beginning the first quarter of the program in winter, 1981. Also, students in the second quarter of the program communicated their satisfaction to the new students, and they continued to use the tutorial services of the Reading/Writing Skills Center on a voluntary basis, as well as to enroll enthusiastically in potential individual study courses in developing pronunciation and listening skills.

Perhaps the most telling indication of success of the students in the program was the fact that 80% of the students enrolled in the program during the fall, 1980, completed the entire course package successfully, and 77% of these students chose to continue in the second quarter of the program in winter, 1981.

During winter quarter, 1981, two sections of the second quarter (CE II) and one section of the first quarter (CE I) of the Commanding English program were offered. The majority of the students continued to be of Southeast Asian origin, but the program included a few other second language students as well. Student comment indicates that this policy should be continued, for the student felt that both their language skills and their understanding of other cultures and backgrounds was enhanced by meeting and working with students of other origins.

Students in the first quarter of the program, many of whom had been enrolled in a pre-Commanding English program in fall quarter, were again required to take all of the courses in the program, with the same additional options of the "Support Seminar" and a weekly "Orientation" session with the coordinator of Commanding English. Students enrolled in the second quarter of the program, however, were given several options. First of all, if they successfully completed the full fall program, they were offered the option of "mainstreaming" (enrolling in the regular General College curriculum) or of continuing in the Commanding English program. Near the end of fall quarter, the Commanding English I (CE I)
staff made recommendations to all CE I students regarding their enrollment in the next quarter. Recommendation included the following: continuation into CE II, "mainstreaming," repeating CE I, enrolling in pre-CE, or no continuation in any CE program, with the future enrollment of the student to be determined by Dewain Long, Admissions Director for the College. The majority of students were recommended to continue in CE II or to mainstream. Students recommended to repeat or to move to pre-CE had had little success with the program for various reasons, the most common being that they were not academically or socially ready for CE I. Students recommended not to continue in any Commanding English program were those for whom the staff felt the program had been of little use, not because the student did not need the work, but because they were hostile to the idea that they had any need to improve their language skills in English. These students had usually attended American high schools and had been in the United States for some time, and while their spoken English was often superior to that of other students, their reading and writing skills were very weak. The staff felt, however, that their hostility to the program had not been overcome in one quarter and that they should not be allowed to continue.

The second option given CE student was related to coursework in the program. They were required to enroll in three courses: a second oral communication course, "Oral Communication: Group Process and Discussion"; a second writing course, either "Fundamentals of Usage and Style" or "Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing," depending on their level of writing skills; and a history course, "The Asian/American Experience," an experimental addition to the program taught by Nobuya Tsuchida, Director of the Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center. Additionally, the students were allowed the option of enrolling in another individual study course in the Reading/Writing Skills Center, again experimentally offered, in "Pronunciation and Listening Skills." Finally, students were allowed to enroll in a non-Commanding English course of their choice, in or outside of General College. The majority of these students chose to take courses in mathematics.

In both CE I and CE II, the work of the courses was carefully integrated within the program. Staff of each program met weekly with the coordinator to discuss student progress, program modification, and program integration.

Following is a brief analysis of each course as offered in Commanding English (I and II) in winter, 1981.

**COMMANDING ENGLISH I**

**GC 1401, "Vocabulary Improvement"**

Margaret Larson, again the instructor of this course, continued to focus on teaching students how to increase their vocabulary on their own through word analysis. After a brief review of how to use a dictionary, the class worked on deciding meanings of unknown vocabulary through contextual clues and through word part analysis.
An addition to this course during this offering was a "word-a-day" exercise. Each Monday the students handed in five new vocabulary words they had encountered during the previous week. They listed the word, gave its part of speech and definition, and they wrote a sentence using the new word. Then, on alternate weeks, the students wrote impromptu paragraphs in class, using their new vocabulary.

GC 1402, "Improving Reading, Comprehension, and Study Skills"

Each of the two sections of this course had a different instructor. Elisabeth Rosenberg, who had taught the course in fall, taught one section, and Jull Gidmark the other.

Rosenberg again focused on four related skills: improving reading speed and comprehension, improving vocabulary, writing summaries of reading, and improving study skills through underlining. Weekly, students read two to four essays from two texts, American Topics and Improving College Reading, as well as from handouts of classics in world literature. The readings varied in difficulty, with about half the class time spent working on reading individually and in groups, using reading machines. Vocabulary was taught through homework assignments in which students used vocabulary words in the context of sentences, and weekly summaries of one of the readings were discussed with the course assistant and rewritten. By the end of the quarter, students were asked to write a timed in-class summary relying only on memory. Finally, students concentrated on using the study skill of underlining as a study aid and to prepare for examinations. Rosenberg's students were evaluated on the basis of the McGraw-Hill Reading Test used as a pre and post-test as well as a test of speed and comprehension based on one of the classroom readings.

Gidmark's goal, relatively similar to Rosenberg's, was to guide her students toward achieving greater comprehension of their reading and to introduce them to a variety of study skills. Students were assigned readings in the basic text, again American Topics, and were required to purchase an English dictionary, used both in skills practices and as a reference aid. A typical week included discussing a lesson from the text; working on such study skills as taking notes, marking textbooks, outlining, and studying for examinations; and doing in-class readings and exercises. In addition, students were also required to summarize a weekly reading (without benefit of class discussion). Gidmark's students were evaluated with a pre- and post-reading test and a mid-term and final examination covering the essays in American Topics and study skills.

Both instructors reported marked gains in comprehension and reading speed.

GC 1403, "Improving Spelling and Punctuation," and GC 1404, "Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs"

Maureen Messer continued to coordinate the assignments and activities of
these "individual instruction" courses offered in the Reading/Writing Skills Center and to meet with the students in progress conferences. Instruction was self-paced and presented by the Skills Center tutors.

The syllabus and goals of the courses were the same as in the fall offering, with emphasis on three areas: Directed sentence and paragraph writing coordinated with the readings and discussion topics of the other classes; basic grammar, usage, and punctuation presented on an individual basis through the text, Basic Grammar and Usage; and spelling improvement. While the students brought to the course better writing skills than their predecessors (most of their initial writing assignments were clear and understandable), they made less improvement, with many of them leaving the course with skills at the same level as at their entrance. While they were not as proficient in their writing, they were competent, and incorporating grammatical structures from their text into the assignment helped them to realize the connection between knowledge and practice. Few students had any difficulty with spelling improvement.

GC 1465, "Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication"

The philosophy of this course, taught by Margaret Larson, was to teach the students to apply practically the theories of the textbook, Monologue to Dialogue. As a supplement to the text, Evelyn Unees Hansen's Study Guide to Monologue to Dialogue was used. Each student presented five oral assignments, keyed to the text, while being videotaped. Following each videotape assignment, the students reviewed that tape and wrote an analysis of the presentation. The analyses dealt with such topics as verbal and nonverbal strengths and weaknesses, the handling of the specific subject, and audience reaction to the presentation. As a final project, each student wrote an overview analysis of his or her progress during the quarter and commented on the value of videotaping in the Commanding English program. All but one of the responses favored the continuation of the videotaping approach as beneficial to improving all aspects of oral communication.

COMMANDING ENGLISH II

GC 1464, "Group Process and Leadership"

Two sections of this course were offered during winter, 1981, by Evelyn Hansen, whose goal was to present students with a combination of theory about and practice in small groups. Students learned about the dynamics of groups—how they form, what roles and tasks members perform, how leadership develops, how groups build cohesiveness, and what part conflict and its management play. Students formed groups, and their groups presented three group discussions, spaced throughout the quarter. The discussions were videotaped, and the participants were required subsequently to study and critique their taped performances. In the three discussion assignments, the groups were presented with a dilemma: to select a subject both appropriate and of interest to the members of the group, to
research the topic by drawing on library and community resources, to construct group and individual outlines of the discussion, and to present the discussion in its polished form to an audience of their classmates while it was being videotaped. The first discussion assignment was a question of fact; the second, a question of value; and the last, a question of policy.

Through these exercises, students learned at two levels: the cognitive and the affective. At the cognitive level, they were introduced to the American library system and began to understand how to use it. They learned a logical system for use in analyzing data, issues, and problems. They learned principles of exposition and how to apply them in preparing outlines and developing ideas. They practiced thinking and talking about intellectual subjects in English, their newly-acquired language. At the affective level, they experienced primary and secondary tension of group work in an enlightened way, most of them realizing for the first time the role and significance of those processes. They participated in the struggle for leadership and learned to recognize their own role and style in determining the outcome. They experienced conflict and experimented with ways of managing it. Through practice in these exercises and heightened understanding of the processes they experienced, students gained increased confidence in their ability to participate in group work and to make worthwhile contributions.

Two textbooks provided instruction in theory and guidance for its application: Effective Small Group Communication and Group Discussion and Decision Making. Two unit tests were given (of three planned). The first test was part objective and part subjective, and it revealed the need for Commanding English students to learn more about the theory of making and taking objective tests. Most of the students performed very well on the subjective tests. In lieu of the final examination, students were required to write an evaluation of their discussions and to analyze the growth they experienced throughout the quarter. Through this project they were given another opportunity for analysis and critical review and were enabled to proceed to a higher level of thought— to synthesis.

GC 1405, "Fundamentals of Usage and Style" and GC 1421, "Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing"

Originally, two sections of a 1405 and 1421 combination course were planned, with Sally L. Chirinos teaching one section and Lisa Washburn teaching the other. Because the two sections were offered at the same time, however, the two instructors were allowed the latitude to divide the courses, as they did. Upon entrance into the course, student took a grammar and usage test and wrote an in-class essay. On the basis of the results of the test and essay, they were placed in 1405 or 1421. Sally Chirinos taught the more elementary "Fundamentals of Usage and Style" class, and Lisa Washburn taught the "Writing Lab" section. Both instructors felt the students benefited from the course division since they could then give full attention to students at a single level of writing proficiency.
The success of "Fundamentals of Usage and Style" may also be attributed in part to the class size—only 32 students. Class time was used specifically to work through the units of the text. Commanding Sentences (either in one or two groups), for working on sentence combining techniques from *The Writer's Option*, and for testing. The students, therefore, had less "independent" work in both areas and more work in class under the teacher's guidance than in a combined 1405/1421. Additional class time was devoted to writing in class, time that would have been lost in a larger, combined class.

Over the quarter, students showed extensive progress, improving 60 to 65 per cent from pre- to posttest in sentence combining and 25 per cent in grammar. The initial writing sample showed no student prepared to undertake 1421; a final writing sample showed 10 of the 12-fully prepared and 2 close to being prepared.

Lisa Washburn's section of "Writing Lab: Personal Writing" concentrated on writing four major essays and work in the text, *The Writer's Option*. The theme topics, taken from the first five chapters of *Notes for the General College Writing Laboratory: Narrative and Expository Writing*, included a description, a portrayal of a personality, a self-interpretation, and the recreation of an experience. For each theme, the instructor and her undergraduate teaching assistant spent about three weeks and two hours of individual conferencing during class time working with students. The students turned in a rough draft and a first draft, both of which were discussed individually with them. The second draft was graded, and revisions were required although they did not influence the final grade. Many of the students turned in outstanding essays, often relating their personal traumas and tragedies.

Class time was divided mainly between discussing the material in *Notes* and working on exercises in the first nine units of *The Writer's Option*, which lent itself very well to small group work. To counter the rather lethargic class discussions of student essays in *Notes*, students were asked to choose a favorite essay in each chapter and to analyze it on various levels. Discussion was much improved. Many students became quite proficient at combining sentences in novel and effective ways. Additionally, students wrote three in-class essays on assignments relating to description, desribing a person, and self-interpretation. These short essays were graded and revisions were required. Some of the more perfection-oriented students had difficulty with this task and were reluctant to hand in papers. If they worked on them out of class, they received a lowered grade.

Students worked on grammar in a more limited way than those students in 1405. They worked the exercises in the Handbook to *Notes* as well as duplicated exercises on particularly troublesome problems of adverbial clauses, participles, and transition words. *Modern English: A Practical Reference Guide* was difficult to integrate into the course due to its late arrival as a text, but a reference work of this type was recommended for later offerings of 1421.

Finally, the class discussed and worked several exercises on figures of speech and the appropriate use of a thesaurus, particular problems for second language learners.
GC 1469, "Individual Study: Oral Communication," optional course

This optional course was offered individually through the Reading/Writing Skills Center. Fourteen students contracted with tutors to earn one or two credits working on pronunciation, listening, and conversation on a one-to-one basis throughout the quarter. Within these restrictions, tutors and students were relatively free to focus their work on individual needs. Perhaps the best way to summarize the range of results and successes is to quote comments from the students' final project for the course, a self-evaluation of their progress in improving pronunciation, listening, and conversation:

She let me listen to ending sounds and teach me how to recognize them.

After taking this class, I feel enjoyable and confident to talk to any American.

One quarter is not enough for me to learn my pronunciation as I expected. However, I noticed that I feel more confidence to speak English than before.

There are some sounds which are difficult for Vietnamese pronounce, for example, I could not pronounce clearly between /æ/ sound and /e/ sound, /j/ sound, etc. before, but after practicing some times with you, I got them. I mean now I can pronounce and even discriminate them when I hear you talking.

The GC 1469 improved my English very much. It helped me express my ideas, read something more easily.

I told her that I needed help in special words I had trouble with in my daily general speaking so, we changed to what I wrote down all the words I am having trouble with.

At the end of the quarter I have written some dictations; I can distinguish some similar sounds, and especially, though I have just registered for one credit for pronunciation, but actually I have improved something in listening.

According to me the most difficult to me is speaking and listening. At the beginning of the quarter, I was very afraid of that. I could not speak and listen well as now. I feel more confident, more fluent.

I tried thinking by English while I spoke with you. You know, at first time it was difficult for me to do that, but I could do so little by little.

All of the students reported similar experiences, increasing confidence in talking to Americans and in understanding them, increasing confidence in being understood. Many of them also discussed the cultural exchange they had experienced in working with a native-English-speaking American tutor. They discussed differences in traditions, their experiences leaving
Vietnam, current news stories, art, and literature. Perhaps this was the real strength of this course, the opportunity to work on making themselves understood and on 'understanding' a native speaker with an American student, a peer, on the one-to-one basis necessary to develop a comfortable working relationship.

In spring quarter, 1981-82, all three levels of the Commanding English course was offered to students not yet at the entry level English Placement Score required for Commanding English I (CE I). Again, the majority of students were from Southeast Asia, but other second language students (students from Saudi Arabia, Colombia, the U.S.S.R., and Turkey, for example) were welcome.

The program of courses for first quarter (CE I) and second quarter (CE II) students remained essentially the same, with only one change. Students in both CE II and CE III (the added third quarter component) were encouraged to enroll in GC 1836, "Asian/American Literature," another experimental addition to the program taught by Nobuya Tsuda, Director of the Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center, in place of GC 1835, "The Asian/American Experience," which had been offered winter quarter. Again, students in CE II were offered the option of individual study in "Pronunciation and Listening Skills," and again they were allowed to enroll in a non-Commanding English course of their choice, in or outside of General College. While most of these students chose optional mathematics courses, a number selected courses in music and history offered in General College.

Students in Commanding English III were enrolled in either GC 1421 or GC 1422, "Writing Lab: Personal Writing," or "Writing Lab: Communicating in Society," depending on their level of writing skill, with most of the students completing their freshman English writing requirement in spring quarter by taking GC 1422. Several additional courses were available to the students, depending on their individual needs. These courses included "Asian/American Literature," "Individual Study in Pronunciation and Listening" (students could take this course twice, once in CE II and once in CE III), and "Improving Study Skills and Vocabulary," offered individually through the Reading/Writing Skills Center. Students in CE III were for the most part encouraged to take most of their coursework in "mainstream" courses. Again, as in CE II, students were allowed the option of continuing in the program or of electing full mainstream coursework.

During spring quarter, the full Commanding English teaching staff met in weekly staff meetings with the coordinator. It was decided that program staff at all levels (including Pre-Commanding English) would benefit from a shared meeting since student progress could be looked at on a continuing basis, rather than in the light of a single quarter's efforts. Also, staff from different levels of the program could be better acquainted with all levels of the program so as to more effectively coordinate coursework and effort.

The following brief analysis of each course as offered in Commanding English (pre, I, II, and III) in spring quarter focuses on development of the curriculum and modifications of prior offerings.
PRE-COMMANDING ENGLISH (formerly ASPECT)

GC 1415, "Reading Comprehension and Study Skills for Non-native Speakers of English"

During the spring quarter, because of the limited number of student involved, only one course of the pre-Commanding English program was offered (with students making up the balance of their enrollment in non-credit English as a Second Language courses offered in the Department of English as a Second Language).

In choosing which pre-Commanding English course to offer, the coordinator looked for a course which already covered as many of the communication skills components as possible. GC 1415 seemed ideal because the course work included (in addition to the stated subject matter of reading and study skills) work on writing summaries, vocabulary practice, and oral communication in class discussion.

The course instructor, Bronwyn Benson, had acted as the course assistant during the previous quarter, and she offered essentially the same course content, with a few modifications in learning to recognize main ideas and major details in their reading. Ms. Benson reported that students did show satisfactory improvement in their reading comprehension, though the actual course delivery presented some challenges because students did not appear to be as highly motivated or well-prepared as those from prior quarters.

COMMANDING ENGLISH I

GC 1401, "Vocabulary Improvement"

Elisabeth Rosenberg, the course instructor, divided class time so that two-thirds of the course was devoted to learning word parts and one-third time to mastering American idioms. The students were especially eager to learn and use American idioms and responded well to the text, Essential Idioms in English, by Robert J. Dixson. No text was used to teach word parts, Rosenberg felt she had not been able to locate a text that was suitable, so she used a considerable number of course handouts for this part of the course. Students were evaluated on all of the word parts they had studied and on the mastery of idioms, with 20 of the 26 students scoring above 70 per cent on the final test.

Rosenberg used her course assistant to work closely with students on idioms; she felt the experience of supervised classroom teaching was valuable to both students and the assistant, since the students had the benefit of two distinct styles and paces in their instruction.
GC 1402, "Reading Comprehension and Study Skills"

Both sections of this course were taught by Margaret Larson, who felt the small class size facilitated discussion in class and enabled her to give special attention to those students who desired or needed extra help.

In addition to using the same text, *American Topics*, as in previous quarters, Larson also assigned weekly selections by a 20th century American writer, with the intention of developing the students' awareness of crosscultural adjustment, as opposed to the readings of *American Topics* which focused on the teaching of American culture. Students summarized the selections by 20th century writers and, as the quarter progressed, were required to deal with specific questions about the reading in their summaries.

In addition to readings from *American Topics* and the reading selections by American writers, students worked on improving reading speed while retaining comprehension in two weekly out-of-class readings. Students also had the option of reading and summarizing James Clavell's *King Rat* or Maxine Hong Kingston's *The Woman Warrior*, and they spent one class hour weekly working on improving their study skills. While students' reading speeds greatly increased, they suffered no loss in comprehension level as a result of this increase.

GC 1403, "Improving Spelling and Punctuation" and GC 1404, "Writing Grammatical Sentences and Developing Organized Paragraphs"

Maureen Messer, coordinator of these course offerings through the Reading/Writing Skills Center, reported that students in the spring quarter made encouraging progress in learning to follow written directions, to write clearly, and to stick to a single point. The majority did excellent work in reviewing basics of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Messer reported that some students questioned the wisdom of a prescribed package of courses and suggested more freedom of choice in CE I, but that most felt that the program was invaluable academic preparation.

GC 1465, "Oral Communication: Interpersonal Communication"

Evelyn Hansen, course instructor for GC 1465, reported that students in the spring quarter offering of the course were influenced by having been enrolled in pre-Commanding English (ASPECT and ESL) for two previous quarters. As a group, they had developed some unacceptable patterns of communication (such as interrupting others, shouting out interpretations of another's statement while the other was trying to express thoughts in English, frivolity, inattention, and boisterousness). Her first priority was, therefore, to guide the establishment of new norms of acceptable behavior, a process which took about half the quarter. Students again made five videotaped pre-
sentations and again completed study guide questions for selected chapters of *Monologue to Dialogue*, and as the quarter progressed, more and more of the students participated in discussions and lost their fear of being laughed at or interrupted by more aggressive classmates.

During this quarter, Hansen additionally required students to meet in small groups with her course assistant to review their videotapes and to share their observations with each other about the presentation. The process brought about excellent results in the students' combined reviews and analyses. Hansen also employed a former student in the program as a reader for the course. By dividing her course assistant time between a native speaker of English and a former Commanding English student, Hansen gave her students the benefit of parallel written and oral dimensions.

For their final project, students reviewed their five videotapes with the course assistant, Denise Chirpich, to describe the level of their communication when the quarter began and to trace their progress through the quarter, noting what changes, if any, had occurred. Without exception, students invested much time and thought in their projects, as the following final report, typical of the many conscientiously prepared analyses submitted in this course, indicates:

Ten weeks ago, when this quarter began, my English was too poor, so I was anxious at times I had to communicate with American people because I did not understand what they spoke and couldn't answer their questions. I also couldn't express my ideas to them because I knew only a little English vocabulary. Besides, I got many mistakes when I wrote compositions. That was caused by the lack of grammar knowledge. I didn't like reading all types of English books because it was difficult for me to understand. I had to consult English-Vietnamese dictionary many times. Therefore, I did not have enough time for doing other work.

During the quarter, when my teacher required us to make videotapes I felt wretched. I wasn't worried very much about the writing assignment because I might use the dictionary and grammar book to write correctly, but my pronunciation was terrible with foreign accent. My classmates would laugh at me. After the first videotape I got experience and made the next one better. And little by little, other courses such as reading comprehension, essential idioms in English, basic grammar, spelling, etc., gave me a great progress in English communication. Besides, by listening to teachers everyday I got used to English intonation and pronunciation. The improvement of my ability to communicate in English was seen after four weeks of studying. I got higher scores in my assignment with good observations of teachers, and I could talk to them more easily. I think the latest videotape with Denise Chirpich was the most successful videotape of mine. The composition was clear and almost perfect, the reading presentation was better than before, my/accents was correct.

Now, after the quarter, the ability to express my ideas in English is enough for communication with American people. I don't need to ask someone to accompany me for translating when I go anywhere. I
can talk correctly and read faster and better. I think I have made the most improvement in English in listening. Before, I had known a lot of English vocabulary which I didn't know how to speak. I didn't understand the idea of dialogue. That caused me many obstacles to communicate in English. However, I think I still have to try to improve my pronunciation and express more rapidly my ideas.

These observations reflect the student's perspective and provide evidence that the parts of the program are connecting and coming together in an integrated whole.

---

**COMMANDING ENGLISH II**

GC 1405, "Fundamentals of Usage and Style" and GC 1421, "Writing Lab: Personal Writing"

Two dominant problems in student writing particular to second language learners noted by the instructor, Suellen Rundquist, were the use of articles and use of participles, but even in these areas student writing showed significant improvement.

In noting recommendations for future offerings in this course, Rundquist consistently recommended more use of materials which were specific to the needs of second language learners. She found using the sentence combining test, The Writer's Option, for example, much less helpful in this class than in a mainstream section, chiefly because the materials were so culturally specific. She also noted that The Open Book (the General College journal of student writing, the first issue of which was published in Spring, 1981), would fulfill the need for examples of writing by non-native English speakers.

Students in 1405 wrote five short themes and completed nine units of Helen Mills' Commanding Sentences, a text in fundamentals of sentence structure, while those enrolled in 1421 wrote a total of eight themes, three of which were impromptu assignments.

---

GC 1464, "Group Discussion and Leadership"

In this quarter, the instructor, Evelyn Hansen, continues to focus her attention on several basic issues, including the feasibility of teaching CE II students the Dewey method of reflective thinking, of their learning to understand the dynamics of group process, to organize groups, to select leaders, and to participate in the research and preparation of discussion topics, to think about social and political issues, and to do all of this, giving voice to all of this, in English.

As difficult as this process is for native speakers, it is even more difficult for student for whom English is a second language, but they can,
and do, learn these concepts, and they are proud of their growing ability to think about and to discuss complex issues in the three oral assignments of the quarter: the question of fact, of value, and of policy. Of singular importance is perhaps the fact that this course serves as an excellent prelude to GC 1422 "Writing Lab: Communicating in Society" which the students take in Commanding English III, for it provides practice in using the skills needed for scholarly inquiry and writing.

Again, the oral assignments are videotaped group discussion projects which students are also required to review and analyze. New this quarter was the specific assistance of a teaching assistant, Denise Chirich, who helped the students to study their videotapes and provided the essential supplementary instruction necessary to realize the full worth of using videotape.

In addition to the videotaped group discussions prepared by the students, they took three objective tests, chosen because the concepts of the course and the textbook presentation of them lent themselves to such testing and because these students have little experience with objective test and needed to learn how to take them. While such practice was insufficient, it was a beginning in aiding them in understanding theories and strategies of objective test-making and taking.

Hansen hopes also to develop course materials necessary to adapt the textbook for the course to the needs of non-native speakers of English, similar to the study guide to the test developed for GC 1465 in CE I.

COMMANDING ENGLISH III

GC 1421, "Writing Laboratory: Personal Writing" and GC 1422, "Writing Laboratory: Communicating in Society"

The success of prior quarters of the Commanding English program is reflected in CE III, in which the sole required course is the appropriate writing lab. According to the instructor, Sally Chirinos, 90% of the 1422 students could have succeeded equally well in mainstream sections and the same was true of about 40% of the 1421 students. Students in both classes showed definite improvement in their writing skills over the ten-week quarter. Chirinos attributed much of the improvement to the large amount of one-on-one contact the student had with tutors in the Reading/Writing Skills Center. She estimated that 28 of 34 students used the Skills Center regularly, and that without such tutoring, the progress students made in the quarter would have been slower and less noticeable.

The large class, thirty-four student, made it difficult at times for the instructor to work with both classes, and she recommended that in future, if the class is a large combined section, that a weekly recitation hour be scheduled separately with the course assistant, so that students can get more individual attention. Some type of weekly division of the groups
is wise, since students in the two classes have different concerns in discussing assignments. When the two classes are combined, as they were this quarter, it is essential that the course assistant be available for work in the classroom.

GC 1406, "Improving Study Skills and Vocabulary Development" optional course

This course was offered optionally to CE III students who felt they needed work on additional vocabulary skills and on learning to take objective and essay test. Students enrolled in the course through the Reading/Writing Skills Center and they worked on either or both units of the course. The test-taking techniques for both subjective and objective questions and with applications of the techniques on quizzes based on readings from the student's writing lab class. Students were allowed to use the readings in taking quizzes, since it was the technique of answering the question, not the content of the question, which was being evaluated.

In the vocabulary improvement unit, students studied words in context, dictionary and pronunciation skills, and reviewed roots, prefixed and suffixed. They were tested on vocabulary with two pretests and post-tests (one standardized pair) and with three unit quizzes.

This was the first time this course was offered to CE III students in this form, and while some improvements were needed, such as additional forms of quizzes and tests, and more careful monitoring of student progress, the students who elected to take the course made definite progress in both areas.

GC 1469, "Oral Communication: Individual Study" optional course

This course was optionally available to both Commanding English II and Commanding English III students, through individualized contracts made with tutors in the Reading/Writing Skills Center. The course continued to be one of the most popular and successful optional courses, chiefly because of the individual attention given students by their tutor project monitors. Several student evaluations of their own work were quoted in the segment on winter quarter's CE II offering of GC 1469. The comments of the tutors in their "Project Monitor's Final Report on Individual Study-Project" reports are equally telling. The advantage of one-on-one tutoring with an individualized approach taken by each tutor-tutee pair is readily apparent:

They began the quarter with a rather low level of motivation, but... this increased substantially as we overcame certain problems.

In addition to discussing new words and language difficulties, we did some oral readings from a book of American short stories and had a few group discussions with other Vietnamese students.

He worked through much of a pronunciation book, and I gave him frequent quizzes on the new sounds he had learned.
She seems to have gained in her confidence to converse with a native English speaker and claims, as evidence of this, the growing number of instances in which she now meets to converse with Americans.

Every week we would discuss various topics—some directly related to language and pronunciation, others more general in nature. Trinh made quite noticeable progress in his ability to converse freely with me.

After each talk I would point out problem areas and together we would try to generalize about the problem and come up with ways of alleviating it in the future. Then we would continue an informal 2-way talk on her topic, and I would encourage further explanation or clarification. Usually the talks made it clear to me which specific sound patterns we should do exercises on.

This quarter, I felt she was ready to do some more advanced, more interesting exercises, such as reading editorials, reviews, etc. In working with her this quarter, I could see that she was very consciously using and integrating the things she learned last quarter.

CONCLUSIONS

Throughout the 1980-81 academic year, the Commanding English program developed in a number of ways as the staff and students shared experiences and used those experiences to improve and modify the program. Programmatic development over the course of the year included increased coordination of course materials through full staff meetings of teachers from all levels of the program.

These staff meetings and discussions led to the development of a revised placement policy for 1981-82. Students admitted to the College are placed in the Commanding English program on the basis of their English Language Proficiency Tests. (The tests, the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, and the Minnesota Composition Test, are administered in the Testing Center of the University and evaluated by the Department of English as a Second Language.) The score divisions for placement in the program were defined more clearly and adjusted on the basis of the year's experience. Students are now placed in Commanding English with composite scores of 55 to 69 (55-62, Pre-Commanding English; 63-69, Commanding English I). Students with scores of 70 and above are not required to enter Commanding English, but those with scores of 70-75 are encouraged to enroll in Commanding English II or III, depending upon the breakdown of those scores; and those with scores above 75 are allowed to enter Commanding English III if they request it. Admission to General College at the Pre-Commanding English and Commanding English I levels is conditional. Continued enrollment in General College is contingent upon satisfactory completion of all courses through the end of Commanding English I or a composite score on the English Language Proficiency Test of 70 or above.
During fall quarter, 1980, both a Pre-Commanding English program (then a separate program called ASPECT, under the coordination of Professor Jill Gidmark), and a credited English as a Second Language program (offered with staffing through the Department of English as a Second Language) were offered. Some modifications in these programs resulted over the year. First, ASPECT was brought under the auspices of Commanding English, as Pre-Commanding English, during spring quarter. This move allowed for increased staff communication, simplified scheduling and coordination, and a clearer relationship between the Pre-Commanding English and Commanding English I levels of the program.

A second modification involved the offering of Pre-Commanding English and the ESL program. Because of such factors as cost (the ESL program could only accommodate 15 students in each section) and student misunderstanding of the function of the ESL and Pre-Commanding English programs, it was decided that the ESL program would not be offered again and that the Pre-Commanding English program would be limited to fall quarter only. Students in the ESL program in fall, 1980, had taken the Pre-Commanding English program in winter, 1981, and felt they had developed their English proficiency sufficiently. They mistakenly equated ESL and Pre-CE, both of which included no courses from the regular General College curriculum, with CE I and CE II and felt they were ready for mainstream coursework. Much of spring quarter the staff had to devote time and energy to correcting this attitude, and the results were only moderately successful. Also, the coordinator and several of the staff felt that it was important that students reach a sufficiently advanced level in the course of one academic year to carry skills and knowledge of English over the summer break. Students in ESL in fall had only completed one quarter of the regular program by the end of the year, and students who began Pre-CE in spring had completed no regular academic work by that time. The modified offering of Pre-Commanding English during fall quarter only was put into effect for the 1981-82 academic year.

During winter and spring quarter non-Asian students, who welcomed the opportunities for cross-cultural understanding and increased practice in English (often as the only common language). The program staff, therefore, recommended that one-fifth of the program spaces be reserved for non-Asian students who wished to participate in the program, and that recommendation was effected in fall, 1981.

An additional development resulting from the Commanding English program was the inauguration of a new journal, The Open Book: A Journal of Student Writing. Student writing in the two General College writing labs (GC 1421 and 1422) related personal experiences in the students' native lands, showed the development of a style and perspective in English, and offered the students an opportunity to share experiences and knowledge, both of their own cultures and in reaction to American culture. The results were impressive, and therefore, The Open Book was conceived of as a vehicle for sharing the writing of these students. (The Open Book is not limited to publishing Commanding English students' work; the fall issue is devoted to the work of all special program students and the winter issue is open to the writing of all General College students.) Student, faculty, and community response to the first issue was warm and impressive.
Throughout the academic year, it became increasingly clear that among the many factors contributing to the students' successful development of English language skills in Commanding English, four were crucial:

1) Size: The program operated effectively when size of each section was limited to 25 students, allowing time for individual attention from instructors and tutors.

2) Assistance: It is imperative that instructors continue to be assisted by undergraduate teaching assistants assigned to their courses. Course delivery of this package is more time-consuming and more intellectually draining, and without the assistance of UTA's much of the benefit of the program would be lost. A side benefit results from the fact that most UTA's are also tutors in the Skills Center (allowing for continued contact in future quarters) or are former Commanding English students, now enrolled in "mainstream" courses and programs in the University.

3) Attendance: Each course has required attendance, with only a certain number of absences allowed. In addition, students are required to take the entire program, and they may not cancel any part of it. Because of this requirement, students learn to use the class time to their best advantage, practicing the very skills they will need to compete successfully in the University environment.

4) Coordination: The program staff of instructors and coordinator meet weekly to discuss program coordination, individual student problems and concerns, and to share relevant concerns. In addition, the program staff is housed in the same wing of offices, allowing for frequent interaction of staff (and students). Without close coordination activities, Commanding English would become a series of discrete courses, rather than a program of integrated language skills courses.
Appendix I: Tables
Table 1
Commanding English I, Fall, 1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning 6 Grade or Better</th>
<th>% of C Grades</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of Passing Grades</th>
<th>% of Incompletes</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits (N)</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals (W)</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (%)</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1401 Larson (2 sections)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1402 Larson (2 sections)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1402 Rosenberg (2 sections)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1403 RWSC-Messer (2 sections)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>94 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1404 RWSC-Messer (2 sections)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>97 NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1465 Hansen (2 sections)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>96 1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (10 sessions per credit required).
Table 2
Commanding English I, Winter, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning C Grade or Better</th>
<th>% of C. Grades</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of Passing Grades</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits (W)</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals (W)</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (R)**</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1401 Larson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1402 Gidmark</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1402 Rosenberg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1403 RWSC-Messer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1404 RWSC-Messer</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1465 Larson</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (10 sessions per credit required).
Table 3
Commanding English I, Spring, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning C Grade or Better</th>
<th>% of C Grades</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of Passing Grades</th>
<th>Number of Incompletes (I)</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits (N)</th>
<th>% of N's</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals (W)</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (%)</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1401 Rosenberg</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1402 Larson</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1403 RWSC-Messer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1404 RWSC-Messer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1465 Hansen</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1702 Dnistran</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>S/N</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (30 sessions per credit required).
Table 4

Commanding English II, Winter, 1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning C Grade or Better</th>
<th>% of C Grades</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of Passing Grades</th>
<th>Number of Incompletes</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits</th>
<th>% of N's</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (2)*</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1405 Chirinos</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1421 Washburn</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1444 Hansen</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1449 RWSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one credit</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two credits</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (10 sessions per credit required).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning C Grade or Better</th>
<th>% of C Grades</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of Passing Grades</th>
<th>Number of Incompletes (I)</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits (N)</th>
<th>% of N's</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals (W)</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (%)</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1405 Rundquist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1421 Rundquist</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1464 Hansen</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1469 RWSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

included with CE III students, Table 6

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (10 sessions per credit required).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course and Instructor</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Number of Class Meetings or Required Sessions</th>
<th>Number Earning C Grade or Better</th>
<th>Number Earning Passing Grade</th>
<th>% of C Grades</th>
<th>Number of Incompletes</th>
<th>% of I's</th>
<th>Number of No Credits</th>
<th>% of N's</th>
<th>Number of Withdrawals</th>
<th>% of W's</th>
<th>Mean CE Course Grade (A=4, B=3, etc.)</th>
<th>Attendance Rate (%)*</th>
<th>Average Number of Absences Per Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC 1406 RWSC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one credit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two credits</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1421 Chirinos</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC 1422 Chirinoa</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one credit</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two credits</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Attendance rate in Reading/Writing Skills Center courses is based on the student's number of sessions working in the Center (10 sessions per credit required).
Table 7
PROGRAM COMPLETION AND RETENTION RATES, 1980 - 1981

Commanding English I, 13 required credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed Total Program</th>
<th>Completed Partial Program</th>
<th>Total Required Class Hours</th>
<th>Attendance Rate</th>
<th>Continued in Program Following Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>GPA* (CE)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td><strong>3.27</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commanding English II, 8 required credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed Total Program</th>
<th>Completed Partial Program</th>
<th>Total Required Class Hours</th>
<th>Attendance Rate</th>
<th>Continued in Program Following Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>GPA* (CE)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td>85</td>
<td><strong>3.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commanding English III, 4 required credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Completed Total Program</th>
<th>Completed Partial Program</th>
<th>Total Required Class Hours</th>
<th>Attendance Rate</th>
<th>Continued in Program Following Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>GPA* (CE)</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computed on 4.0 Scale, i.e., A=4, B=3, etc.
Appendix II: Staffing and Evaluation

The Commanding English program was staffed with faculty, graduate teaching associates and assistants, and teaching specialists during 1980-1981. Evaluation data for the program was reported to the coordinator in tri-quarterly reports on each student and in quarterly summary of information and results submitted to the coordinator at the close of each quarter. Much of the narrative of this report is derived from those contributions, and the data tables were developed from the data of the quarterly reports and final grade reports for each class.

The following Commanding English staff members contributed, therefore, to the success of the program during 1980-81 and to this report:

- Sally L. Chirinos, Teaching Associate I
- Rebecca Dnistran, Teaching Associate I
- Jill Gidmark, Assistant Professor
- Evelyn Hansen, Professor
- Margaret Larson, Teaching Specialist
- Maureen Messer, Graduate Teaching Assistant
- Elisabeth Rosenberg, Teaching Associate I
- Suellen Rundquist, Teaching Associate I
- Lisa Washburn, Teaching Associate I