

**SECOND LANGUAGE GRADUATION
REQUIREMENT**

AD HOC STUDY GROUP

REPORT

March 4, 2008

Members

Debra Ambrosetti (Secondary Education)
Radha Bhattacharya (Economics; co-chair)
David Fromson (College of Natural Science and Mathematics)
Mitchell Hanlon (Theater and Dance)
Irene Lange (Marketing/International Business)
Roberta Rikli (College of Health and Human Development)
Paul Rumberger (Associated Students, Inc. Vice President of Finance)
Brad Starr (Comparative Religion and Liberal Studies; co-chair)
Ying-Chiao Tsao (Human Communication Studies)
Marjorie Tussing (Modern Languages and Literatures)

We thank Dolores Vura for IR&AS data and Marilyn Miller for her assistance in arranging our meetings.

**SECOND LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT
AD HOC STUDY GROUP REPORT
TABLE OF CONTENTS**

42		Page
43		
44		
45		
46		
47	INTRODUCTION	3
48		
49		
50	PART I: Issues and Recommendations Related to the SLGR as a	
51	University Graduation Requirement	4
52		
53	A. The Wisdom of Having Program/Major Exemptions	4
54	1. The Issue	4
55	2. The Data	4
56	3. The Recommendations	5
57	a. The Case Against Exemptions	6
58	b. Obstacles Associated with a No-Exemption Policy	7
59	c. The Study Group Conclusions and Recommendations	
60	on Exemptions	9
61		
62	B. The Impact, if any, of the CSUF Requirement of 3 Semesters	
63	Versus 2 Semesters	10
64	1. The Issue	10
65	2. The Data	10
66	3. The Recommendations	15
67		
68	PART II: Recommendations Related to Issues Internal to UPS 410.107	15
69		
70	A. Double Counting	15
71	1. The Issue	15
72	2. The Data	16
73	3. The Recommendations	17
74		
75	B. Possible Internal “Inconsistencies” in UPS 410.107	18
76	Issue 1: The Definition of “Intermediate” Proficiency	18
77	Issue 2: Placement Examinations.....	20
78	Issue 3: Board Recommendations on Program Exemptions..	20
79	Issue 4: Board Recommendations on Student Requests for	
80	Exemptions.....	21
81	Issue 5: Board Requests for Unmet Instruction Needs.....	21
82	Issue 6: AP Unit Credits and the SLGR	21
83		
84	PART III: Overall Conclusions	22
85		
86	PART IV: Overall Recommendations	22

87 **INTRODUCTION: THE SECOND LANGUAGE GRADUATION REQUIREMENT**
88 **AD HOC STUDY GROUP AND ITS TASKS**

89
90 UPS 410.107 “Second Language Graduation Requirement” (hereafter SLGR)
91 was scheduled for implementation for first year students Fall, 2006, and for
92 transfer students Fall, 2008. On April 13, 2006, however, the Academic Senate
93 approved a proposal, subsequently numbered ASD 06-67, submitted by AS
94 Chair Jack Bedell. This document suspended implementation of UPS 410.107 for
95 two years and called for further study of the SLGR and its implications. In Fall,
96 2007, the Academic Senate extended the period of suspension by an additional
97 year.

98
99 According to AS 06-67, the AS Executive Committee was to appoint an SLGR Ad
100 Hoc Study Group (hereafter The Study Group) to study and report on the
101 following four areas of concern: (1) “the wisdom of having program/major
102 exemptions from University graduation requirements; (2) double counting’s role
103 in completing graduation requirements; (3) the impact, if any, of the CSUF
104 requirement of 3 semesters of study relative to 2 semesters; (4) possible internal
105 inconsistencies in the document.” (ASD 06-67)

106
107 The members of The Study Group are listed on the first page of this document.
108 Formed in May, 2006, The Study Group met monthly during the academic year
109 from August, 2006 to January 2008, holding more frequent meetings during the
110 final six weeks. The Study Group analyzed the implications of data as it emerged
111 from the studies undertaken by Institutional Research and Analytical Studies
112 (hereafter IR&AS) at CSUF. Dolores Vura, Assistant Vice President, IR&AS met
113 several times with The Study Group to present and discuss this material. The
114 Study Group also consulted with key people connected to SLGR issues: Lee
115 Gilbert, former chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures
116 and former chair of the Academic Senate (2002-2004); Dawn Valencia, Director,
117 University Outreach; Claire Palmerino, Associate Dean of Administration, College
118 of Humanities and Social Sciences; Sylvia Alva, Associate Vice President for
119 Undergraduate Programs; and Jan Eyring, Chair, Department of Modern
120 Languages and Literatures.

121
122 The remainder of the Report is organized as follows. Part I of the Report focuses
123 on the issues and recommendations related to the SLGR as a University
124 graduation requirement. The two areas of inquiry under this heading are (A)
125 exemptions and (B) the effects of moving from a three year/ three semester
126 requirement to a two year/ two semester requirement. Part II of the Report
127 presents recommendations related to issues internal to the SLGR. The two areas
128 of inquiry under this heading are (A) double counting and (B) internal
129 inconsistencies within 410.107. Part III presents the overall conclusions of the
130 Report and Part IV provides recommendations.

131 **PART I: ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO THE SLGR AS A**
132 **UNIVERSITY GRADUATION REQUIREMENT**

133
134 **A. The Wisdom of Having Program/Major Exemptions from University**
135 **Graduation Requirements**

136
137 **1. The Issue**
138

139 UPS 410.107 provides exemptions from the SLGR for programs and majors that
140 meet either of two criteria. (A) Under I.B.1, “high-unit” programs may request an
141 exemption. “High unit” programs are defined as programs “for which the
142 combination of major requirements, GE requirements and/or accreditation
143 requirements cannot be accommodated in a baccalaureate program within 120
144 units.” (B) Under I.B.2, other programs “in which requirements for the
145 baccalaureate degree total at 110-120 semester units” may also request an
146 exemption. In both cases, requests are submitted to the Vice President of
147 Academic Affairs by way of the Dean of the College.
148

149 The issue involved in this provision is whether it is appropriate to exempt
150 significant numbers of students from graduation requirements to which other
151 students are held.
152

153 **2. The Data**
154

155 **a. Programs and eligibility for exemptions**
156

157 Programs currently eligible for exemptions:

- 158 ○ College of Business and Economics (CBE): All programs except Economics.
- 159 ○ College of Engineering and Computer Science (ECS): All programs.
- 160 ○ College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM): All programs.
- 161 ○ College of Health and Human Development (HHD): Nursing, Kinesiology
162 w/Athletic Training Certificate, students enrolled in Streamlined Teacher
163 Education Preparation (STEP)
- 164 ○ College of the Arts (COTA): All BFA and BM programs.
- 165 ○ College of Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS): STEP

166
167 Programs currently ineligible for exemptions:

- 168 ○ Humanities and Social Sciences: All programs except STEP.
- 169 ○ Communications: All programs.
- 170 ○ Health and Human Development: All programs except those noted above.
- 171 ○ Arts: All BA programs
- 172 ○ Business and Economics: Economics

173
174 **b. The number of actual requests for exemptions**
175

176 All eligible programs requested and have been granted exemptions.

177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216

c. Percentages of students in exempt programs

Using IR&AS numbers from the Spring, 2006 census data, the following figures are relevant to the issue of exemptions.¹ Of the 28,305 students listed as enrolled in declared and undeclared majors:

(1) 8.7% (2,462 students) were enrolled in majors exempt under category I.B.1 (120+ units);

(2) 30.65% (8,676 students) were enrolled in majors exempt under category I.B.2 (110+ units).

(3) 0.45% (128 students) were enrolled in STEP.²

(4) Hence, 39.8% (11,266 students) of undergraduates in Spring, 2006 were enrolled in majors that are exempt from the SLGR.

In addition, note should be taken of IR&AS data, collected from SIS+ and presented to The Study Group at its October 26, 2007 meeting (IR&AS, October 26, 2007, p.3) regarding declared majors in Fall 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007. The data on transfer enrollees indicate that in each semester respectively, 37.7%, 34.5%, 34.7%, and 34% of the students declared majors that are exempt. In addition, 15.8%, 17.8%, 18.6%, and 16.3% of entering freshmen in the same years declared exempt majors.

3. The Recommendations

In significant respects, the issue of exemptions lies at the heart of the very rationale for the SLGR. Accordingly, The Study Group spent more time discussing this issue than any other. In the section below, we first consider the case against exemptions, followed by an examination of the impact of the loss of exemptions on high unit programs.

In brief, our conclusion is that if the SLGR is to be a graduation requirement, it must *in principle* apply to *all* students. The consequences of such an application, however, are unacceptable for high unit programs, and hence the SLGR cannot apply to all students. Consequently, second language proficiency is not feasible as a university-wide graduation

¹
[http://www.fullerton.edu/analyticalstudies/StatisticalHandbooks/Spring2006/PROGRAMS/2.44.2.06 UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS BY LEVEL SPRING 2006.xls](http://www.fullerton.edu/analyticalstudies/StatisticalHandbooks/Spring2006/PROGRAMS/2.44.2.06_UNDERGRADUATE_MAJORS_BY_LEVEL_SPRING_2006.xls)

² According to Fall 2005 figures from the Center for Careers in Teaching. STEP figures are only available for Fall semesters.

217 **requirement.** Instead, we found ourselves searching for a more flexible
218 alternative that, among other possibilities, would promote rather than require
219 second language proficiency.

220

221 **a. The Case Against Exemptions**

222

223 The Study Group's interpretation is that the rationale set forth in ASD 02-12
224 rested explicitly on the principle that if the SLGR is a necessary mark of
225 academic excellence, then it is a requirement that should apply to *all* CSUF
226 graduates. Other than the reference to the high number of unit requirements for
227 the affected programs, however, The Study Group could find no rationale in that
228 document for the original adoption of exemptions.

229

230 Given the reasoning in ASD 02-12, there seems to be no coherent and principled
231 rationale by which the university could adopt a graduation requirement on
232 grounds that it is fundamental to excellence, a mark of a CSUF graduate, and
233 then exempt 35-40% of its students from the requirement. By the same token,
234 there is no rationale provided that justifies the imposition of this requirement on a
235 60-65% selection of students.

236

237 In fact, the resulting pattern of exemptions at CSUF seems to run counter to what
238 is suggested in ASD 02-12 as well as in reputable external reports on second
239 language proficiency. For example, in his meeting with the The Study Group, Dr.
240 Lee Gilbert ³ referred The Study Group to the 2006 report issued by the
241 Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development,
242 entitled *Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies
243 and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security*.⁴ This
244 document makes the case primarily for promotion and inclusion of language
245 study at the pre-baccalaureate level. Page 2 of the document says, "The
246 educated American of the twenty-first century will need to be conversant with at
247 least one language in addition to his or her native language, and knowledgeable
248 about other countries, other cultures, and the international dimensions of issues
249 critical to the lives of all Americans." The document goes on to single out three
250 areas at the baccalaureate level where advanced second language proficiency is
251 particularly crucial: engineering, the medical fields, and business. These are
252 precisely the three primary areas that are exempt from the SLGR at CSUF.⁵

253

254 If there is a university-wide commitment to the SLGR as a mark of academic
255 excellence, the commitment should find expression in a *university-wide*
256 requirement. The fact that all eligible programs chose to exercise their

³ Former Chair of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, and Academic Senate Chair 2002-2003 and 2003-2004.

⁴ Published in 2006 by the Committee for Economic Development
(http://www.ced.org/docs/report/report_foreignlanguages.pdf

⁵ pp. 2, 26, 29.

257 exemptions may well indicate that other academic and practical factors
258 outweighed the added value represented by the SLGR. By extension, however,
259 one might wonder if this argument could be applied to the goals of students and
260 faculty in every department or discipline.

261
262 Finally, it should be noted that none of the five CSU campuses that currently
263 require some level of university-wide second language proficiency for graduation
264 provide exemptions for any program.^{6,7}

265 266 **b. Obstacles Associated With A No-Exemptions Policy**

267
268 Approximately 25% of freshman students (over 1,000 students) and 40% of
269 transfer students (1,600 students) would need between one and three MLL
270 classes as per IR&AS Fall 2007 figures and the IR&AS survey of Fall 2007
271 transfer students respectively. The practicality of such a requirement poses
272 several difficulties, especially in three areas: (1) units and time to graduation; (2)
273 loss of enrollment to other institutions; and (3) the dedication of elective units (in
274 category 1.B.2 programs⁸) to specific supporting courses related to preparation
275 for careers in the respective disciplines.

276
277 1. The impact of the SLGR on time to graduation should be given careful
278 consideration. According to IR&AS data, CSUF has steadily held its ground at or
279 near the lead with respect to time to graduation for both native students and
280 transfer students, and has consistently outperformed its peer CSU campuses
281 over the last few years (IR&AS, pp.16-17, Oct 26, 2007). High unit majors cannot
282 accommodate up to 13 units in addition to the units already required. For
283 example:

284
285 In the case of the Biological Science major, 43 units are required in the
286 major, 51 units are required in General Education courses, and 30 units
287 are required in supporting courses. The total number of specified course
288 units is 124, leaving students in this major with no free electives. The

⁶ San Diego State University is not included in the five. SDSU requires second language proficiency only for students in the Liberal Arts and Sciences. There are also reduced and specialized second language requirements for programs leading to the Bachelor of Music degree. Second language proficiency is not required in programs leading to the following degrees: (1) B.A. in Applied Arts and Science; (2) B.S. in Applied Arts and Sciences; (3) B.F.A. in Applied Arts and Sciences; and (4) Bachelor of Vocational Education. According to Dr. Jane Smith (email of January 14, 2008), SDSU Assistant Vice President for Academic Services, 39% of undergraduates in Fall, 2007 were in programs *with* a language requirement. 61% were in programs with *no* requirement.

⁷ Please see Appendix, Second Language Graduation Requirements at CSU campuses: Summary of Course Requirements.

⁸ Programs with 110-120 units are allowed exemptions under UPS 410.107 I.B.2. Programs with 120+ units are allowed exemptions under I.B. 1.

289 situation is the same for the majors in Chemistry/Biochemistry, Geological
290 Sciences, Mathematics and Physics.

291
292 In the case of the College of Business and Economics, some of the
293 concentrations in the Business Administration major have zero free units
294 available and the others have a maximum of three units available. These
295 numbers assume that an incoming freshman is eligible to go directly into
296 calculus. However, the majority of incoming freshman are required to
297 complete Math 115 before taking calculus. The units earned through Math
298 115 use up the free units, leaving most business majors with zero free
299 units.

300
301 In the case of The College of Engineering and Computer Science all
302 programs are high unit majors with specific accreditation requirements.
303 The college does not have the flexibility of accommodating a second
304 language without increasing their total units.

305
306 Removal of exemptions would cause a significant increase in the time to
307 graduation rates in currently exempt majors, causing a discrepancy with the CSU
308 wide directive on facilitating time to graduation.⁹

309
310 Moreover, the increase in time to graduation due to the SLGR may not be
311 justified in terms of curricular needs as shown with the following examples:

- 312
313 ○ A recent study conducted by Wake Forest University, involving deans,
314 recruiters, and alumni of undergraduate business schools, indicates
315 that knowledge of a second language is at bottom of the list of
316 desirable business student competencies, but the ability to work
317 effectively in a culturally diverse work environment ranks higher in the
318 list.¹⁰
319 ○ A statement from the College of Engineering and Computer Science,
320 CSUF, emphasized that a second language requirement on engineers
321 and computer scientists "...is not warranted by the accreditation
322 standards of ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and
323 Technology), is not mandated by the professions, and is not welcomed
324 by the faculty and students of the college."¹¹

325
326 2. Enrollment concerns are also central to the issue of exemptions. According to
327 IR&AS data, over 50% of transfer students in Fall 2006 and Fall 2007 would have
328 needed to complete two or more semesters of second language course work
329 (IR&AS p.3, Oct. 26, 2007). Given this requirement, the enrollment management

⁹ Memorandum dated August 2, 2005 from Chancellor Reed to CSU Presidents; Subject: Facilitating Graduation

¹⁰ What Makes for An Excellent Undergraduate Business School? March 2007, http://calloway.wfu.edu/pdfs/what_makes_for_an_excellent_undergraduate_bs.pdf

¹¹ Email statement from the ECS chairs council, CSUF.

330 experts on campus as well as community college administrators and counselors
331 project a substantial reduction in the number of students who would transfer from
332 their community colleges to CSUF.

333

334 For example, in an April 2007 survey of 34 area community college counselors,
335 29 indicated the SLGR would have a negative impact on transfer enrollments. “If
336 students have to take a third semester of language, wrote one, “it is more likely
337 they will have an interest in another CSU. The majority of students don’t even
338 take a foreign language.” Another wrote, “So much is already required with major
339 prep and GE. I think it would have a negative impact” (IR&AS p.24, Oct. 26,
340 2007).

341

342 Similarly, an IR&AS poll of 936 current CSUF transfer students, 20% (189)
343 reported that if the SLGR had been in place when they were preparing to
344 transfer, they would have considered another university or would definitely not
345 have come to CSUF, these shares being 16% and 4% respectively. Another
346 13% (124) said they weren’t sure what they would have done.

347

348 Furthermore, at a September 18, 2006 meeting hosted by the CSUF H&SS
349 Dean’s office, the 11 Humanities and Social Sciences Deans in attendance, all
350 from CSUF “feeder” community colleges, unanimously predicted enrollment
351 losses for CSUF. “Counselors would hate it,” one commented. “They would direct
352 students to an institution where they could graduate in less time.”¹² This
353 prediction was echoed by administrative counterparts in the Science and Math
354 programs at feeder community colleges. “The fact that there are exceptions for
355 high unit majors will go unnoticed (counselors will advise ECS majors to go
356 elsewhere even though they would be exempt from the requirement here)”
357 (IR&AS, Oct. 26, 2007, p.27).

358

359 3. Exempt programs under category 1.B.2 need to use elective units for
360 supporting courses that are essential to the success of graduates in their future
361 careers. These courses are not expendable as part of the academic preparation
362 of majors.

363

364

365 **c. The Study Group Conclusions and Recommendations on Exemptions**

366

367 **The Study Group holds that a coherent university graduation requirement**
368 **should apply to all students and, if genuinely supported, should be**
369 **embraced across the various academic programs in the university. The**
370 **current requirement does neither.**

371

372 Nearly 40% of students are exempt, and every eligible program asked for an
373 exemption. The practical consequences of the SLGR for currently exempt

¹² Notes from September 18, 2006 meeting of CSUF and community college Humanities and Social Sciences Deans.

374 programs in terms of time to graduation, program enrollments, and use of
375 elective units are matters of serious concern. Imposing the SLGR on these
376 programs would result in ongoing division and controversy. At the same time, the
377 current policy (as indicated in UPS 410.107) results in an uneven and arbitrary
378 requirement that contradicts the original rationale for the SLGR.
379

380 **Accordingly, the consensus of The Study Group is to recommend the**
381 **formulation of a more flexible and more comprehensive alternative to the**
382 **SLGR. The replacement program would strongly *promote* second language**
383 **proficiency, but would take seriously the concerns that led to the adoption**
384 **of exemptions in the first place.**
385

386 **The groundwork for such an alternative was prepared in 2000 by the**
387 **International Education Committee at CSUF in document ASD 00-169,**
388 **“Internationalizing the Curriculum at California State University, Fullerton:**
389 **A Position Paper of the International Education Committee.” We**
390 **recommend revisiting this document as a guide to the construction of a**
391 **comprehensive, university-wide “global competence” requirement that**
392 **would include a range of strategies that promote a multi-dimensional**
393 **international perspective.** The goal would be to build internationalizing features
394 and options into existing programs without increasing program unit loads. Further
395 consideration of this alternative is provided in the conclusion of this document.
396

397

398 **B. The Impact, If Any, of the CSUF Requirement of 3 Semesters of Study** 399 **Relative to 2 Semesters**

400

401 **1. The Issue**

402

403 The Study Group was asked to consider the impact of changing the SLGR from a
404 3 semester-college / 3 year-high school (3-3) to a 2 semester-college/2 year-high
405 school (2-2) requirement.
406

407 **2. The Data**

408

409 a. Semester Requirements at Other CSU campuses vary across campuses with
410 a second language requirement:

Bakersfield	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High school = 2 years ○ Transfer = 1 semester
Channel Islands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1 semester of foreign language. (101-212 range) for all. ○ No high school requirement specified.
Monterey Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Freshmen: 4 semesters. Assessed at entry and exit. ○ Transfer: 3 semesters. Assessed at entry and exit. ○ No high school requirement specified.
Sacramento	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High school = 3 years ○ Transfer = 2 semesters
San Diego*	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High school = 4 years ○ Transfer = 3 semesters <p><i>*These requirements apply to B.A. programs in the Liberal Arts and Sciences only (39% of students)</i></p>
San Marcos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Evidence of proficiency at 201 level (3 semesters) for all. ○ No high school requirement specified.

412

413

b. CSUF First Year Students

414

415 According to IR&AS data (October, 26, 2007, pp.3-4) for the Fall 2007 semester,
 416 approximately 1,063 first year students in non-exempt majors would have
 417 needed either to enroll in a third semester of foreign language or to prove
 418 language proficiency through one of the approved methods.¹³ For the sake of
 419 analysis, assume that 25% percent (266) of these students were able to pass a
 420 CSUF administered language proficiency exam. The remaining 797 students
 421 would have needed to take a third semester second language course. Assuming
 422 class sizes of 30 students, 26 sections of third semester SLGR courses would
 423 have been required to meet this need alone. Were exemptions to be lifted, the
 424 resources needed would increase to accommodate an additional 500 students.¹⁴

425

426 Moving to a 2-2 requirement, however, would maintain the current CSU-wide 2
 427 year foreign language admission requirement for first year students and would
 428 not require these students to take any additional MLL classes. Further, a move
 429 to 2/2 would render moot the problem of program exemptions with respect to
 430 native CSUF students.¹⁵

431

432

c. CSUF Transfer Students

433

434 On the one hand, a move to a 2/2 requirement would bring CSUF into line with
 435 the UC second language proficiency requirement for transfer students, a
 436 requirement exceeded by the current 3/3 standard. On the other hand, The
 437 Study Group has serious concerns about the 2-2 requirement for the reasons
 438 discussed after analysis of the data below.

439

¹³ 25.6% of 4154, Fall 2007 First Year Students, IRAS, October 26, 2007, p.3.

¹⁴ 75% of 16.3% of 4154, Fall 2007 First Year Students, IRAS, October 26, 2007, p.3.

¹⁵ The move would also eliminate some problems related to double counting in GE III.B.2. This matter is discussed in the next section

440 Lack of data from the high school transcripts of transfer students led The Study
441 Group to use survey data from Fall 2007 transfer students supplied by IR&AS.¹⁶
442 Most of the information that we do have about high school work and other forms
443 of evidence of proficiency is based on *self-reported information* from current
444 transfer students.¹⁷ According to this IR&AS survey , assuming a Fall incoming
445 transfer cohort of 4,000 students:

446

- 447 ○ 41% (1,640 transfer students) would need to submit their HS/CC
- 448 transcripts to be cleared by their coursework
- 449 ○ Four percent (160 transfer students) would need to submit their HS
- 450 foreign language diplomas to be cleared
- 451 ○ 15% (600 transfer students) would need to submit their AP score, or
- 452 Certification of Proficiency, or ASL transcripts to be cleared
- 453 ○ 40% (1,600 transfer students) would need to be advised regarding
- 454 which path would be most appropriate for them to clear the
- 455 requirement at CSUF

456

457 Out of the 1,600 transfer students who need to be advised, approximately:

458

- 459 ○ 45% (720 students) might possibly obtain certification of intermediate
- 460 proficiency through other means,¹⁸ presumably through testing and
- 461 passing the speaking and listening components of the intermediate
- 462 proficiency test. It must be noted that the 45% is obtained in the
- 463 survey as *self reported* assessments of proficiency. Therefore in
- 464 reality the numbers that pass the test may indeed be smaller.
- 465 ○ 1.87% (30 students) typically go abroad for a semester.¹⁹
- 466 ○ 53.13% (850 students) take coursework at CSUF to meet the SLGR.

467

468 Assuming that exemptions are intact, and that 34% of the transfers are in exempt
469 majors, a minimum of 561 transfer students (66% of 850) at a minimum must
470 make up the deficiency of second language classes through coursework at
471 CSUF.

472

473 With a 3-3 requirement, of the 561 transfer students: 140 students
474 ((10/40) * 561) will need 3 classes; 322 students ((23/40)*561) will need 2
475 classes and 98 students ((7/40)*561) will need one class. Assuming a

¹⁶ In Fall 2007, transfers to CSUF who are “not exempt and needs 1 CSUF course” is 3.4% of the transfers; “not exempt and needs 2+ CSUF courses” is 54.4% of the transfers Therefore, going from 3 to 2 (CSUF courses) would remove the need for 3.4% of the transfers to take any MLL courses. However, since we do not know the number of transfers needing 2 as opposed to 3 semesters of second language coursework, this data does not indicate to us how many will need 1 as opposed to 2 courses if the requirement is 2 CSUF courses. (Source: IR&AS, Oct 26 p 3.)

¹⁷ IR&AS, Second Language Learning Survey of Recent Transfers to CSUF—Report of Findings, February 21, 2008

¹⁸ For reasons such as having exposure to a foreign language through family background.

¹⁹ Quote obtained from Study Abroad office, February 22, 2008. IR&AS survey referred to “consider study abroad”

476 class size of 30 students, 38 sections would be needed for transfer
 477 students in Fall 2007 under a 3-3 requirement with exemptions intact.
 478 Adding this to the 26 sections from first year students, would lead to a total
 479 of $38 + 26 = 64$ sections/classes to meet the 3-3 requirement with
 480 exemptions intact.

481
 482 With a 2-2 requirement, no first year students would need to take a
 483 second language class. The number of transfer students who need to
 484 take a second language would be reduced by 98 students. This will result
 485 in 35 sections/classes of MLL classes that would be needed in Fall 2007
 486 under a 2-2 with exemptions intact.

487
 488 If exemptions are lifted, similar calculations would lead to the following
 489 conclusions:

490
 491 With a lifting of exemptions and a 3-3 requirement, assuming 4,154 first
 492 year students as in Fall 2007: 41.4% of first year (16.3% the previously
 493 exempt category would now not be exempt, and 25.15% who would need
 494 an MLL course). Assuming 25% test out, a total of 1,277 students would
 495 need the MLL with a 3-3 requirement, leading to $(1,277/30) = 42$ sections
 496 for first year students with exemptions lifted and a 3-3 requirement. Add
 497 to this 850 transfer students who would need MLL classes in the following
 498 ratios: 10/40 needing 3 classes, 23/40 needing 2 classes, and 7/40
 499 needing 1 class. This leads to 58 sections/classes assuming 30 students
 500 per class. The sum total of first year students and transfers who would
 501 need MLL classes under a 3-3 with exemptions lifted is 100
 502 sections/classes.

503
 504 With a 2-2 requirement; no first year students would need to take the MLL
 505 and $(33/40)*850$ transfer students would need to take two MLL classes.
 506 This translates to 46 sections/classes of MLL classes.

507
 508 **Summary of Sections of MLL Classes Needed in Fall 2007²⁰**
 509

	With Exemptions	Without Exemptions
3-3	64 sections (26 sections for freshman + 38 sections for transfers)	100 sections (42 sections for freshman + 58 sections for transfers)
2-2	35 sections (0 sections for freshman + 35 sections for transfers)	46 sections (0 sections for freshman + 46 sections for transfers)

²⁰ Table Notes: (i) Data is from IR&AS Second Language Learning Survey of Recent Transfers to CSUF, February 21, 2008.

(ii) Calculations of sections needed are conducted by the Study Group and are based on 30 students per section.

510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534

Listed below are issues that should be carefully weighed in determining the implications of a 2-2 requirement.

- i. Results from a survey of community college counselors at the April, 2007 conference sponsored by the CSUF-AAC (Academic Advisement Center), provide examples of the perceived impact of the SLGR on transfers to CSUF. Of the 34 counselors who responded to the survey question, 29 said that a 2-2 requirement would still result in a possible negative impact on transfer enrollments at CSUF. A perceived increase in time to graduation rates at CSUF would make other CSU campuses in our region—none of which have second language graduation requirements—more attractive as transfer destinations (see IR&AS, Oct. 26, 2007, p.21-27).
- ii. If exemptions are removed, a 2-2 requirement would still have a direct impact on colleges that have no free units available by adding extra units needed for their graduation. Transfer students constitute 58.8%, 35.1%, and 21.3% of the student body in The College of Business & Economics, Natural Sciences & Mathematics, and Engineering & Computer Science respectively.²¹ The table below indicates the approximate number of transfer students in each college who need to complete the current SLGR based on an extrapolation of *self-reported* IR&AS survey data of recent CSUF transfer students to the actual number of recent transfer students.²²

COLLEGE	Total number of transfers	Percentage needing to complete SLGR	Number needing to complete SLGR
ARTS	467	55%	257
CBE	2259	49%	1107
COMM	1168	59%	696
ECS	156	55%	86
HHD	1246	58%	723
HSS	2181	55%	1199
NSM	312	55%	171

535
536
537
538
539
540

- iii. As is the case with a 3-3 requirement, a 2-2 requirement for transfer students will have a restrictive influence on student course selection in the Humanities, as well as on the non-FL Humanities departments, at the community college level. Students would almost certainly be advised to take both required FL courses in the Humanities section of General

²¹ IR&AS: Fall 2007 Distribution of New Transfers, Ever Transferred, and Total Undergraduates. These figures are percent share of transfers relative to all new students in Fall 2007

²²Table Notes: Data is from IR&AS February, 2008 Survey Data of Transfer Students from Fall 06, Spring 07, and Fall 07. Calculation of the number of transfers is conducted by the Study Group.

541 Education Area C. This issue will be discussed more carefully in the next
542 section.

543

544 **3. The Recommendation**

545

546 A reduction of the requirement from 3-3 to 2-2 would eliminate the impact on all
547 incoming freshman and lessen the impact on transfer students. However, if
548 exemptions are removed, transfer students into exempt programs who do not
549 test out by passing the listening and speaking tests of the second language, for
550 example, will face unit requirements in excess of 120 units (see above, p.4, for a
551 list of exempt programs). Even if exemptions are left in place, however, the
552 possible impact on transfer enrollments remains a concern. The majority of
553 community college counselors and administrators, when surveyed on the issue,
554 cautioned CSUF in this regard.

555

556 **The Study Group does not recommend a 2-2 arrangement as a solution to**
557 **the complications created by the SLGR. Rather than a 3/3 or a 2/2**
558 **requirement, The Study Group prefers a more flexible and comprehensive**
559 **approach to global competence that includes and promotes second**
560 **language proficiency as one of a number of possible options.** The Study
561 Group again recommends revisiting ASD 00-169 as a guide to the construction of
562 a comprehensive, university-wide “global competence” requirement.

563

564

565 **PART II: RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO ISSUES INTERNAL TO UPS** 566 **410.107 (THE SLGR)**

567

568 ASD 06-67 also directed The Study Group to consider two issues internal to the
569 policies defined in 410.107: (A) Double Counting; and (B) Internal
570 Inconsistencies. Accordingly, we discussed and prepared recommendations
571 related to the areas that follow. These recommendations, however, do not
572 remedy the larger issues, analyzed above, that prompted our overall
573 recommendation to replace the SLGR with a more flexible and workable
574 approach to “global competence.”

575

576 **A. The Role of Double Counting in Completing Graduation Requirements**

577

578 **1. The Issue:**

579

580 Should the university allow one course to meet both the Second Language
581 Graduation Requirement (SLGR) and GE III.B.2 (lower division humanities)?
582 General Education category GE III.B.2 courses include Modern Languages and
583 Literature (MLL) courses that meet the SLGR. Students will meet the SLGR and
584 GE III.B.2 with one MLL course, precluding them from choosing from other lower
585 division Humanities courses offered by departments such as Anthropology,

586 English and Comparative Literature, Comparative Religion, Liberal Studies,
587 Linguistics, Philosophy, and Women's Studies.

588

589 **2. The Data**

590

591 a. According to IR&AS data from Fall, 2006, double counting in GE III.B.2 would
592 have resulted in a migration of 37% of FTES or 790 students enrolled in non-MLL
593 courses to MLL courses.^{23,24}

594

595 b. The FTES migration measured as a proportion of total FTES in each
596 department is as follows: Anthropology, 3%; English and Comparative Literature
597 3%; Comparative Religion, 18%; Liberal Studies, 3%; Linguistics, 11%;
598 Philosophy, 11%; and Women's Studies, 11%.

599

600 c. Implementation of UPS 410.107 will result in a large-scale alteration of student
601 choice and learning in the lower-division GE humanities. Since the lower division
602 GE-breadth categories are intrinsic to the definition of a CSU liberal arts
603 education, these curricular consequences should be subjects of principled
604 reflection.

605

606 IR&AS data related to native CSUF students indicate that in Fall 2007, 25.6% of
607 first year students would have migrated to MLL courses in GE category III.B.2 in
608 order to double count a SLGR course (IR&AS p.10, Oct. 26, 2007).²⁵ Under such
609 provisions, the resulting pattern of choice and experience in the Humanities
610 would amount to a serious redefinition of the category itself. Moreover, in terms
611 of both lower division course enrollments and effective recruitment of majors, the
612 resulting migration would seriously disrupt other departments in the category.

613

614 d. In many respects, the effects of double counting related to transfers are
615 greater than those related to native students. According to IR&AS data, 5,893
616 students transferred to CSUF in AY 06-07. Of these, as many as 3,361 (57%)
617 were not in exempt majors and needed to provide evidence of second language
618 proficiency.²⁶

619

620 Currently, most transfer students enroll in CSUF by way of the CSU Transfer
621 Certification Plan. Students transferring under this plan who need to take two or
622 more foreign language courses to meet the SLGR will certainly be directed by
623 their advisers to enroll in these courses under Area C—the lower division arts

²³ Research on the Impact of the Second Language Graduation Requirement, Update October 26, 2007, IR&AS, pp. 5-11.

²⁴ 37.44% is obtained as the ratio of 158 FTES to 422 FTES, where there are 158 FTES by students not exempt from SLGR and 422 FTES in Introduction to Humanities Classes.

²⁵ These are Freshman students of Fall 2007 who: are not "Exempt 6+," are not "Exempt by International," are not "Exempt by Major," and "need 1" or "need 2+".

²⁶ Where 3,361 = 3,197 (needs 2+) + 164 (needs 1): p. 4 of IRAS, Update October 26, 2007

624 and humanities area shared with literature, philosophy, ethics, and world
625 religions (see IR&AS, October 26, 2007, p.26).²⁷

626
627 With implementation of the current SLGR, the university, in effect, will impose
628 significant alterations to its GE breadth requirements, resulting in curricular and
629 scheduling implications for transfer students and community college
630 departments. Indications from Humanities Deans at feeder colleges are that such
631 demands would not be welcomed. For instance, the SLGR, noted the Dean of
632 the Humanities Division at Fullerton College, “might devastate enrollment in other
633 general education courses (in the same category as foreign languages) even
634 within our own division, as students skew their gen ed [sic] choices to obtain the
635 most impact per course.”²⁸

636
637 e. Double counting that entails significant alteration of GE patterns, even as an
638 unintended consequence of the SLGR, deserves serious discussion. The
639 following statement, from Executive Order 597, “General-Education-Breadth
640 Requirements,” from the Office of the CSU Chancellor, “seems relevant:

641
642 Campuses may permit double counting of courses for General Education-
643 Breadth and major requirements and prerequisites only after giving careful
644 consideration to the impact of such actions on the General Education-
645 Breadth programs. Decisions to permit double counting in General
646 Education-Breadth and a degree major may be made only after an
647 approval is provided through campus wide curricular processes. (p.5)

648
649 The passage above refers to double counting G.E. courses and required courses
650 for majors and prerequisites, but the scale of the impact of double counting
651 courses for SLGR and III.B.2 surely calls for the same careful consideration.

652
653 f. Finally, it is important to note that none of the five CSU campuses with
654 university-wide foreign language graduation requirements allows the required
655 foreign language courses to substitute for alternatives in the lower division
656 humanities.

657 658 **3. The Recommendations**

659
660 There are three methods that can be used to prevent double counting.

661
662 (i) Sacramento State, CSU Monterey Bay, and CSU Bakersfield resolve the issue
663 by removing the required foreign language courses from the General Education
664 requirements. The MLL representative on The Study Group, however, indicated

²⁷ The General Education curriculum is divided into subject Areas with unit requirements attached to each. Area C is The Arts and Humanities.

²⁸ Dan Willoughby (Dean of Humanities Division, Fullerton College), email to Claire Palmerino, September 20, 2006. Follow-up email from the meeting of the Humanities and Social Sciences Deans from CSUF and area community colleges, held September 18, 2006.

665 that MLL would object to any arrangement that removed these courses from GE
666 III.B.2.

667

668 (ii) Second language requirements at CSU San Marcos, and CSU Channel
669 Islands avoid the problem by placing the required foreign language courses in a
670 separate lower division Humanities category. This solution is not possible for
671 CSUF, however, since the available lower division Humanities GE units are
672 already devoted to the World History requirement, leaving only 3 units for III.B.2,
673 and no units for a separate foreign language GE category.

674

675 (iii) A proposal offered Spring, 2006, and approved unanimously by the Chairs of
676 CSUF Humanities departments, as well as by the University General Education
677 Committee, provides another way to resolve this matter. Similar to the IGETC
678 transfer plan, this proposal stipulates that no course can be double counted to
679 meet the SLGR and GE III.B.2.²⁹ Students would be able to take an MLL course
680 for III.B.2 credit, however, provided the course is not used to meet the SLGR.
681 This policy proposal was sent to the Academic Senate Executive Committee
682 Spring 2006 for further review.

683

684 The Study Group unanimously recommends prohibition of double counting
685 classes required for the Second Language Graduation Requirement and GE
686 III.B.2. If the SLGR is an enhancement of the excellence of a CSUF degree, it
687 should be *added* to current requirements, not *substituted* for some of those
688 requirements. Given that the proposal mentioned in (iii) above is the most
689 feasible avenue toward resolution of the double-counting issue, The Study Group
690 recommends that this proposal be adopted.

691

692

693 **B. Possible Internal “Inconsistencies” in UPS 410.107**

694

695 This section notes some of the apparent inconsistencies in the conception and
696 implementation of UPS 410.107. Many of the items discussed below were
697 brought to the attention of The Study Group, while others emerged from our own
698 deliberations. Descriptions of the concerns are followed by The Study Group
699 recommendations.

700

701 **Issue 1: The Definition of “Intermediate” Proficiency**

702

703 The SLGR calls for each graduate to demonstrate an “intermediate” level of
704 proficiency in a second language. There seems, however, to be a variety of

²⁹ The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is a transfer plan accepted by most UC and all CSU campuses. The IGETC second language component is a UC, but not a CSUF, requirement. Because there are restrictions in course offerings in several IGETC categories, including the Visual and Performing Arts, as well as Critical Thinking, most students planning to transfer to CSU campuses prefer the CSU Certification Transfer Plan. The recommendation above is not to adopt the IGETC in its UC version, but to use its rule on double counting as a model for second language coursework applied toward the CSUF requirement.

705 operational definitions of both the term “intermediate” and the term “proficiency.”
706 For example:

707

708 ○ All CSU campuses with second language graduation requirements call
709 for second language “proficiency,” but each defines this expectation in
710 terms of differing coursework expectations. As can be seen in the
711 Appendix (SLGR at CSU campuses; summary and details), the
712 definition of “proficiency” varies across CSU campuses.

713

- 714 ▪ San Marcos: 3 college semesters
- 715 ▪ Monterey Bay: 4 college semesters
- 716 ▪ Sacramento: 2 college semesters
- 717 ▪ Bakersfield: 1 college semester
- 718 ▪ Fullerton: 3 college semesters

719

720 ○ The current *Standards, Policies, and Procedures for Intersegmental*
721 *General Education Transfer Curriculum, Version 1.0*, (IGETC) requires
722 “competence (*proficiency*) in a language other than English equal to
723 two years of high school study” for transfer into the University of
724 California. With respect to the college coursework equivalent, the
725 document states: “Usually, one semester of college work in a language
726 other than English is equivalent to two years of high school work. The
727 equivalency is usually stated in the college catalog.”³⁰

728

729 ○ According to the Minnesota Language Proficiency Assessment exam,
730 which will be used for proficiency testing at CSUF in Spanish, French,
731 and German, successful completion of 2 semesters would be rated at
732 the “intermediate-low” level, and successful completion of 4 semesters
733 would be rated at the “intermediate-high” level. This exam assesses
734 student proficiency at the 2 and 4 semester levels, but does not assess
735 proficiency at the 3 semester level, which is the operational definition
736 of proficiency in the SLGR at CSUF.³¹

737

738 ○ Further variation in the use of the term “intermediate” appears in the
739 California Articulation Number System (CAN). For example, SPAN
740 102, a second semester course at CSUF, is rated at the “intermediate-
741 mid” level (CAN 4). But the 3rd semester course, SPAN 203 is rated at
742 the “intermediate-high” level (CAN 8). Apparently both 2 semesters
743 and 3 semesters fall in this broader interpretation of intermediate.

744

³⁰ Standards, Policies & Procedures for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, Version 1.0. At http://www.asccc.org/events/sessions/fall2007/materials/AppendixC1_F07.pdf (p.19)

³¹ From the MLPA Web site at <http://www.carla.umn.edu/assessment/MLPA.html#formats>.

745 Recommendation: The terms “intermediate,” “proficiency,” and “competency”
746 seem to be defined by each university in accordance with its own unique blend of
747 academic expectation, local expertise, and varying tools of assessment. Since
748 precision in the assessment of language proficiency may not be possible, the
749 The Study Group believes that CSUF needs to define its expectations in
750 accordance with its own goals and resources. The development of carefully
751 coordinated assessment procedures and proficiency expectations is essential to
752 an equitable and workable requirement. We recommend that the SLGR
753 University Board give close attention to this matter.

754

755 **Issue 2: Placement Examinations**

756

757 Many first year and transfer students will need to complete the SLGR after
758 varying lapses of time since their previous language study. For instance,
759 significant numbers of first year university students (over 1,000 in Fall 2007) will
760 have completed only two years of course work. We can assume that many will
761 have completed this work in their sophomore or junior years in high school.
762 Language skills may atrophy over time, and, combined with varying levels of high
763 school performance and preparation, it is unreasonable simply to assume that
764 students with two years of high school language courses would be prepared to
765 enroll in a third semester university course. Time gaps will certainly be much
766 larger for many transfer students.

767

768 Recommendation: There needs to be a reliable mechanism to assess varying
769 levels of second language proficiency of all students who enter CSUF in need of
770 further coursework. Even though placement exams could require students to
771 repeat course work, further extending their time to graduation, it would be
772 irresponsible to register students in classes for which they are under-prepared.

773

774 **Issue 3: Board Recommendations on Program Exemptions**

775

776 In UPS 410.107 II.A.9, the SLGR University Board is instructed to “review
777 proposals from academic departments seeking exemption for their majors and
778 forward recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.”

779

780 However, no criteria for such recommendations are specified in the policy except
781 the number of units required by the program. By what other standard would such
782 a recommendation be made and forwarded? On the one hand, the current
783 criterion—units—renders moot any review and recommendation by the SLGR
784 University Board regarding high unit majors. On the other hand, if there are
785 criteria according to which low-unit programs can be recommended for
786 exemptions, or under which high-unit programs can be recommended for denial
787 of exemptions, these criteria are not stated. If the university is committed to
788 empowering the SLGR University Board to make significant rulings on program
789 requests for exemptions, criteria need to be constructed and approved.

790

791 **Issue 4: Board Recommendations on Student Requests for Exemptions**

792

793 At present there are no criteria and no policies or procedures in place for
794 addressing requests for exemptions from students with disabilities and other
795 extenuating circumstances. This issue needs to be addressed and policies
796 developed by the Board.

797

798 **Issue 5: Board Requests for Unmet Instruction Needs: Implications for**
799 **University Resource Allocations**

800

801 410.107 II.A.3 calls for the SLGR University Board “to monitor the offering of
802 language classes to ensure that students have ample opportunities to meet the
803 second language requirements... and forward recommendations to the Vice
804 President for Academic Affairs regarding unmet instructional needs.” However, it
805 is not clear how such funding requests would be met. There are serious
806 implications for allocation of additional resources or reallocation of existing
807 resources.

808

809 As indicated earlier in the report (see above, pp.11-13), the number of additional
810 sections/classes needed would be as follows. With a 3-3 requirement 64
811 sections are needed with exemptions intact and 100 sections are needed with
812 exemptions lifted. With a 2-2 requirement, 35 sections are needed with
813 exemptions intact and 46 sections with exemptions lifted.

814

815 Additionally, as noted above, with a 3-3 requirement, for transfer students alone
816 IR&AS survey data indicate that 1,640 students would need their transcripts
817 cleared for their coursework; 160 would need to submit their high school
818 diplomas to be cleared; and 600 students would need to submit their AP score,
819 Certification of Proficiency, or ASL (American Sign Language) transcripts; and
820 720 students would need to take a test to prove that they have attained
821 proficiency. With no exemptions, these numbers would be higher.

822

823 Recommendation: The adequate allocation or re-allocation of funds to cover
824 these needs, even with exemptions intact, is a pressing question that should not
825 be neglected. Recommendations of the Board could have significant implications
826 for the reallocation of resources currently devoted to other programs. Funding
827 implications of the SLGR should be carefully and openly considered.

828

829 **Issue 6: AP Unit Credits and the SLGR**

830

831 Passing a foreign language AP exam meets the SLGR, but unit credits (10) are
832 given only for 101 and 102, and not for 203 (3).

833

834 Recommendation: It is acceptable to separate the issue of awarding units for AP
835 exams from the issue of the use of AP exams to meet a graduation requirement.
836 The Study Group sees no inconsistency in this matter.

837 **PART III: OVERALL CONCLUSIONS**

838
839 **The strong consensus of The Study Group is that the SLGR is not feasible**
840 **as a *university-wide graduation* requirement.**

841
842 1. The extensive necessity for and use of exemptions by university programs is
843 itself evidence of the impracticality of the measure as a graduation requirement.
844 For high unit majors, the additional units cannot be absorbed, and the added
845 benefit of second language proficiency is outweighed by other educational goals.
846 The result is an uneven and arbitrary requirement that falls on some but not
847 others.

848
849 2. The resources required for staffing course sections, processing student
850 transcripts and certifications, and providing placement and proficiency testing are
851 substantial.

852
853 3. Counselors and administrators at our feeder community colleges have
854 cautioned us that the SLGR will weaken the attractiveness of CSUF as a
855 potential transfer destination. An IR&AS poll of 936 current CSUF transfer
856 students, 20% (189) reported that if the SLGR had been in place when they were
857 preparing to transfer, they would have considered another university or would
858 definitely not have come to CSUF, these shares being 16% and 4% respectively.
859 Another 13% (124) said they weren't sure what they would have done.

860
861
862 **PART IV: OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS**

863
864 **The Study Group recommends that serious consideration be given to an**
865 **alternate, more comprehensive requirement that would actively promote,**
866 **rather than require, second language proficiency, and that would not add**
867 **further units to programs.**

868
869 In 2000, the International Education Committee at CSUF produced a document,
870 ASD 00-169, entitled "Internationalizing the Curriculum at California State
871 University, Fullerton: A Position Paper of the International Education Committee"
872 (Fall 2000). We recommend revisiting this document as a guide for the
873 construction of a requirement that fosters student and faculty awareness of the
874 global context in which we live. ASD 00-169 calls for a range of strategies
875 through which to promote a multi-dimensional international perspective, including
876 the following:³²

- 877
878 ▪ Promote the integration of a global perspective in existing courses
879 ▪ Expand courses and programs that develop global and intercultural skills

³² ASD 00-169, Strategies for Internationalizing the Curriculum at CSUF, p.6.

- 880 ▪ Encourage the use of information and communication technologies that
- 881 facilitate access to global resources and cross-cultural interaction
- 882 ▪ Support international and cross cultural activities
- 883 ▪ Promote the learning of a foreign language
- 884 ▪ Encourage semester or year long study abroad programs
- 885 ▪ Develop and encourage other international programs

886

887 Written in 2000, there are specific pressing issues that could be added to

888 illustrate the underlying scope of this list.

889

- 890 ▪ Promote greater understanding of the nature and role of human rights in
- 891 international relations.
- 892 ▪ Encourage greater understanding in the areas of labor relations, economic
- 893 fairness, child labor, and the responsibilities of governments, workers and
- 894 employers.
- 895 ▪ Promote knowledge of global environmental issues and responsibilities,
- 896 and strategies for addressing them.
- 897 ▪ Promote increased knowledge about and sensitivity to cultural similarities
- 898 and differences in the international arena.
- 899 ▪ Encourage greater knowledge of the sources of conflict, peace, and
- 900 violence in the international context.
- 901 ▪ Promote greater awareness of global issues related to poverty, health,
- 902 and educational opportunity.

903

904 Finally, a resolution introduced at the January 17-18, 2008 meeting of the

905 Academic Senate of the CSU (for consideration at the March 6-7, 2008

906 meeting)³³ supports the comprehensive approach to global or international

907 competencies that we are recommending. This resolution, “Support of

908 International Experiences and Global Perspectives in the CSU Educational

909 Programs“ (AS-2818-08/FGA), recommends valuable objectives for

910 consideration, including the following.

911

- 912 • Providing international perspectives to students through a variety of
- 913 curricular and co-curricular activities including cross-cultural experiences,
- 914 programs, and courses such as language, history, literature area studies,
- 915 and study abroad, among others.
- 916 • Endorsing a strong focus on global understanding and cultural
- 917 competencies.
- 918 • Recognizing that international education and experiences increase
- 919 student competitiveness in the global marketplace.
- 920 • Encouraging faculty to integrate language learning and other components
- 921 of international education in curricula, when appropriate.

³³ *Academic Senator*, February 2008. http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Newsletter/2008/tasn_Feb08.pdf
See report appendix for draft of AS-2818-08/FGA.

- 922 • Encouraging faculty to review RTP policies to ensure that faculty’s
923 international experience and accomplishments are recognized and valued
924 in the areas of research and scholarly activity, curricular planning, and
925 professional development.
926

927 In addition, The Study Group strongly recommends consideration of a university
928 level “value-added” formal certification program that would provide university
929 acknowledgment of proven second language proficiency. Although some
930 students might choose to earn a minor in a second language, other certification
931 avenues should be considered, such as proficiency testing, completion of
932 language institutes, coursework, and study abroad involving courses taught in
933 languages other than English. As an enhancement of the marketability of our
934 graduates, certification could function as a stand alone program or work in
935 tandem with the university global competency requirement proposed above.
936

937 Recent polling data from IR&AS suggests that there would be significant student
938 interest in a certification program. For example, in one IR&AS poll of 476 CSUF
939 transfer students, 276 (58%) reported that they believed they had already met
940 the proficiency standards of the SLGR. Of those, 195 (41%) expressed interest in
941 obtaining CSUF certification of their proficiency. (IR&AS, Feb 21, 2008
942 Supplement, p.4)
943

944 **In summary, The Study Group recommends an approach that would**
945 **require graduates to demonstrate a range of global knowledge and skills**
946 **while, at the same time, allowing programs and students to select the skills**
947 **that best fit their own educational and career goals. In many cases these**
948 **goals will include foreign language study; in other cases, however, other**
949 **internationally relevant skills and coursework may be considered more**
950 **essential to student preparation. In such an approach, however, all**
951 **programs would be required to foster, and each student to acquire, a range**
952 **of international competency that is relevant to the specific educational and**
953 **career goals of the student or program. Moreover, gaining an international**
954 **perspective would, in turn, effectively increase student demand for greater**
955 **foreign language proficiency.**
956