Memorandum

From: Virgil Strohmeyer, Patricia Boyle & Mhaer Alahydoian
To: The Admission Committe of AUA
Re: English Testing Procedure and Related Matters.

On reflection, the three of us would suggest the following policy to replace the present English testing procedures: these are now adding to a good deal of redundancy.

If we follow these suggested policy we will avoid repeated test-correcting sessions and increase the responsibilities that various students should be willing to accept so that those entering for English alone will be discouraged.

I. The Testing Program: All students entering the university would be given an English Proficiency Test of our own creation. (We would use the remnants on the many tests we have on file. It would have 4 parts.)

> 1. Oral interview : A team of three teachers would independently assess the interviewed student on his/her a) Pronunciation, b) Grammatical Structure, c) Comprehension / Response. The grade given would be the average of all _three_ assessors.

> 2. A reading examination: We would use the reading component of the UCLA exam.

> 3. A lecture / comprehension examination: Again these would include the former of the present UCLA exam, but we would add lectures available from a number of sources.

> 4. A short essay: This last would be more open ended than the present UCLA essay question and there would be as many as 10 different questions _per exam_. It would be graded as we do the present UCLA exam: by three independent readers using Organization, Content and Grammatical Structure as the cogent criteria.

The source of those tests would not be given as absolutes to the students, rather the students would be sorted into three categories by the English Department's _professionals:_   1) Ready for the academic program 2) Ready for the Intensive English Program: those who can reach levels of Academic competence through a 10 wk. intensive course. 3) Not ready for the IEP: those who simpy are incapable of succeeding through a 10 wk. course. These latter would be advised to acquire further English and try again. The University should provide more basic-English instruction through extension or the English department itself.

The admission committee needn't worry about the English scores of those in the first category. Merely those in the IEP would need an English grade of some kind for further assesment. We suggest that that grade be the grade they receive in the English Program itself.

II. The English Program: The English Program needs to be graded like any university course (this has long been true in UCLA, USC, and WCU). Grades from 1-4 would be given and only those achieving from 3-4 would be considered as passing (this is graduate school afterall). Students now lack sufficient incentives to see the English Program as of real consequence because of the lack of regular grading, and

27-32-39   27-10-85

40 Marshall Bagramian Street
Yerevan, 375019, Armenia
U.S.S.R.

when those grades are sent to the Admissions Committee as the measure of their work, they will be more serious in their studies.

All students would receive three grades which would be combined into their overall English assessment:
1) A grade for their content based lecture course: Engineering, Business or Political Science.
2) A grade for their small group work attached to the lecture courses (adjunct classes).
3) A grade for their oral skills courses.

These grades would be from three different teachers and there would be little room for ultimate inaccurracy.

This procedure would simplify the Admissions Committee's tasks. They would be presented with people whose English had been initially assessed sufficient and those whose English grades would be an accurate indication of their skill levels. These facts combined with GRE's, GMAT's and previous university work would be more than ample evidence of the students capabilities for graduate work.

Addendum: The Matter of Space Allocation in the Spring.

When we have 4 academic programs going at once we are going to find space allocations extremely difficult to decide upon.

The new plan has to have equally new policies to make it effective.

We would like to suggest that moving academic programs anywhere out of the present building is inherently uneconomic. All such programs are funded solely from the University's budget and con-solidation of facilities (for electricity, copying, computing and teaching space) serves the most people, the most economically.

Only those university entities which have their own funding can afford to purchase generators and other materials that might be necessities if they are removed to another location.

As space concerns become pedagogical concerns, we hope that all deans and administrators will take these facts into consideration.

cc Mihran Agbabian
    Michael Kouchakdjian
    Russell Campbell