DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 276   FL 022 025

AUTHOR   Gaies, Stephen J.
TITLE   An Approach to the Evaluation of ELT Preparation
                Programs.
PUB DATE   92
NOTE   21p.; In: Sadtono, Eugenius, Ed. Language Teacher
                Education in a Fast-Changing World. Anthology Series
                29; see FL 022 023.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   College Outcomes Assessment; *English (Second
                Language); Evaluation Methods; Followup Studies;
                Higher Education; *Language Teachers; *Longitudinal
                Studies; *Portfolios (Background Materials); Program
                Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Second Language
                Instruction; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS   *University of Northern Iowa

ABSTRACT
                Discussion of the evaluation of training programs for
teachers of English as a Second Language consists of: (1)
characterization of general approaches; (2) review of reasons for
interest in program evaluation; and (3) description of a University
of Northern Iowa (UNI) evaluation project that uses a portfolio
approach extending 3 years beyond program completion. At UNI,
assessment of teacher trainees occurs at four points in the trainee's
career: at declaration of undergraduate ESL major; at approximately
the second semester of the junior year; during the last undergraduate
semester; and 1-3 years after graduation. The principal method used
is evaluation of a collection of trainee products that individually
and collectively portray trainee attainment. Guidance in portfolio
construction is provided. Experience with this method of student
outcomes assessment suggests these educational and administrative
advantages: it uses student knowledge base, skills, values, and
attitudes as a focal point for program evaluation; promotes a
developmental view of teacher preparation and growth; encourages
formative program evaluation; encourages a developmental view of
teacher preparation; engages trainees as active agents in curriculum
evaluation and development; builds habits of inquiry about student
learning; and reveals the interaction between top-down and bottom-up
processes of curriculum renewal. (MSE)

AN APPROACH TO THE EVALUATION OF ELT PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Stephen J Gaies

Abstract

Although the importance of systematic program evaluation is widely recognized, the focus of discussions of program evaluation in our field has been on language-learning programs. With some notable exceptions, the issues surrounding the evaluation of ELT preparation programs have been given much less prominence. This paper has three purposes: (a) to characterize general approaches to the evaluation of programs that prepare teachers of English; (b) to review the reasons for increased interest in the evaluation of such programs; and (c) to describe an evaluation project now under way to apply a portfolio approach to the evaluation of teachers of English from the time they enter a teacher-preparation program until three years after they complete the program. Although some aspects of the project may be institution-specific (and may thus be less relevant to other teacher-preparation settings), the basic assumptions, principles and procedures of this project may well provide a useful model for the development of systematic evaluation of programs elsewhere.

Introduction

EVALUATION OF TEACHER-PREPARATION PROGRAMS

Program evaluation--the systematic collection of information about the effectiveness of the various components of an educational program--is an area that periodically flashes into prominence in discussions of language teaching and learning. From the much-discussed attempts of the 1960's and 1970's to evaluate the effectiveness of different language-teaching methods to the sharp debate about particular programs--of which the Bangalore/Madras Communicational Teaching Project is perhaps the most salient example--evaluation has typically been recognized as a crucial area of second/foreign language education. Its status as a basic area of interest in our field appears to be growing more solid (see, for example, Alderson & Beretta, 1992).

14

The need for systematic evaluation of teacher-preparation programs is also recognized; however, for a variety of reasons the issues surrounding evaluation of such programs have been less publicized, less controversial. One might speculate that this is the result of a tendency in our field to pay less attention to the teacher's contribution to classroom learning than to other elements: methodology, syllabus, or program model, to name a few. Or perhaps the problem is that evaluation of teacher-preparation programs takes place constantly, at least on an informal basis, as part of the day-to-day, and year-to-year, work of educational institutions. It is often done on an ad hoc basis, without much concern for how the efforts of one institution compare with those of others--perhaps with the view that any evaluation, systematic or not, must be unique. And although it is precisely the uniqueness of any evaluation project that many specialists are now seeking to tap (Cronbach et al., 1980) by encouraging the dissemination of case histories in program evaluation, there are, quite clearly, commonalities in ways in which programs respond to the demand for periodic evaluation.

These typically include some combination of internal and external review. External review in the United States often makes use of some independent accreditation agency--in the area of teacher education, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), together with other bodies, such as the Renaissance Group, a national consortium of higher education institutions with a special focus on the areas of teacher education, or the North Central Association, formulate standards and review programs. For example, of the 1500 or so approved professional education programs in the United States, approximately one third are accredited by NCATE.

Program evaluation is by definition multidimensional. In many cases, an examination of some sort will be used to compare students exiting a program with those completing similar programs. Examinations, together with other quantitative (such as employment rate of graduates, percentage of graduates still in the field after a certain number of years, percentage of graduates participating in professional organizations and other activities) and qualitative measures (such as employer satisfaction with graduates), are often used in conjunction with formal internal and external program reviews in order to evaluate a program.

WHY THE HEIGHTENED INTEREST IN TEACHER-PREPARATION PROGRAM EVALUATION?

All systematic program evaluations have two different aims: one internal and one external. The former has to do with the use of data on student learning (outcomes)

15

3

as a means for validating existing academic programs and for indicating needed or desirable curricular change. It is a means by which the fit between program goals and the activities that make up a program can be measured.

The external aim of student outcomes assessment is to demonstrate the accountability of an institution and of the programs within an institution to the larger public: taxpayers, funding agencies, professional accreditation and licensing bureaus, and all other stakeholders.

Increased interest in the evaluation of programs that prepare teachers of English as a second language is the result of two different external pressures: one that reflects a general demand affecting higher education in general, the other reflecting development within the discipline itself:

1. **The demand that institutions of higher education be held accountable for the quality of the education that they provide**

   During the 1980's, there has been frequent criticism of higher education (including teacher preparation programs) in the United States. Some have criticized the quality of higher education; others target what they claim is a failure of higher education to hold itself accountable and to demonstrate the quality of their programs. In difficult fiscal times, this criticism typically becomes more pointed; in short, to use the phrase currently in fashion in Great Britain, stakeholders want "value for money."

   The result has been increased pressure on higher education generally and professional preparation programs in particular to demonstrate the competence of students exiting such programs. Virtually every state in the United States has enacted legislation or administrative policies that apply both to new and in-service teachers.

2. **The evolution of professional standards**

   Even if higher education were not under attack, teacher-preparation programs are more accountable to emerging standards developed within our own field. In other words, the need for systematic program evaluation is a by-product of the professionalization of English language teaching during the last few decades. The TESOL organization's <u>Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States</u> (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other

16

4

Languages, 1975), its <u>Statement of Core Standards for Language and Professional Preparation Programs</u> (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1984), and its recent <u>Statement on the Preparation of Primary and Secondary Teachers in the United States</u> (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, 1992), together with the procedures for self-study that it has developed for use by individual teacher-preparation programs, are good examples of this.

WHAT IS STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT?

Assessment is part of the larger activity of evaluation:

> Assessment refers to the set of processes through which we make judgments about a learner's [in this case, a pre-service teacher's] level of skills and knowledge. Evaluation refers to the wider process of collecting and interpreting data in order to make judgments about a particular program or programs. (Nunan, 1990, p. 62)

Even in the absence of systematic program evaluation, assessment takes place on a regular basis within the context of individual courses: Testing and grading in any course are basic forms of student assessment. As a part of the larger activity of program evaluation, assessment must be broader in nature. It must aim at the collection, analysis, and interpretation of measures of student learning and performance at the level of major programs; the data collected must serve in gauging the effectiveness of each academic program and of an entire department.

Briefly stated, student outcomes assessment is an attempt to measure student learning as it relates to and informs an academic or professional program, rather than as a narrow measure of individual students themselves. In their discussion of state-based approaches to assessment in undergraduate education, Boyer and Ewell (1988) define student outcomes assessment as

> any process of gathering concrete evidence about the impact and functioning of undergraduate education. The term can apply to processes that provide information about individual students, about curricula or programs, about institutions or about entire systems of institutions. The term encompasses a range of procedures including testing, survey methods, performance measures or feedback to individual students, resulting in both quantitative and qualitative information.

Student outcomes assessment seeks to gather evidence about the congruence between an institution's stated mission, goals and objectives, and the actual outcomes of its academic programs and co-curricular activities. It represents an attempt to assign a central position, in the evaluation of a program, to learning outcomes. It provides an organizing mechanism for addressing "two fundamental questions: (1) What do you expect of your students? and (2) How do you know if your students are meeting your expectations?" (Memo from UNI Student Outcomes Assessment Committee to Department Heads, July 12, 1990)

Two points need to be emphasized. First, student outcomes assessment is not, in and of itself, a form of program evaluation. Rather, it is just one of many vehicles which may help an institution evaluate a program in order to improve teaching and learning and to create a better fit between what it aims to do and what it in fact achieves. Second, the assessment of student outcomes is directed at evaluating of the teacher-preparation program itself (and of its various components), not at determining the success of individual students.

To suggest some of the reasons why student outcomes assessment may be a valuable organizing force in invigorating ELT-preparation program evaluation, this paper will describe one initiative in student outcomes assessment that has recently been developed and will soon be implemented.

AN INITIATIVE IN STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT

Background

In December 1990, the Iowa Board of Regents instructed each of the three Regents universities (The University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and the University of Northern Iowa) to develop its own local plan of outcomes assessment for every undergraduate major. The Regents Office itself was responding to a legislative request for such plans.

The model recommended to the Regents Office by an interinstitutional subcommittee was formulated by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC). A Statement of Principles on Student Outcomes Assessment, approved by the Executive Committee of NASULGC in November 1988, provides the philosophical foundations and strategic rationale for the model.

In response to this directive, a university-wide Student Outcomes Assessment Committee was formed at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) in early 1991. This committee in turn instructed each academic department to form its own Student Outcomes Assessment Committee.

The Draft Plan

The purposes of UNI's Department of English (Language & Literature) Student Outcomes Assessment Plan are (1) to enhance learning among the students who elect the Department's major courses and programs and (2) to provide a factual foundation for the development and improvement of those courses and programs. Although the Plan encompasses all of the Department's major programs, our concern will be with the TESOL Program only.

The Development of the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan for TESOL
The outcomes (goals) and the competencies associated with each of these (see Appendix A) that have been developed for undergraduate TESOL majors are based on a number of efforts to establish standards and goals for ESOL teacher education and TESOL curriculum development. Among these can be mentioned the Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States (TESOL, 1975) and--a more direct influence--the current endorsement requirements for ESL (K-12) formulated by the Iowa Department of Education. Existing mission statements and strategic planning proposals formulated in connection with on-going internal departmental program evaluation were also consulted.

Frequency of Assessment

Assessment will take place at four stages of a student's career:

1.   Declaration of major

2.   Mid-program (defined, for practical purposes, as the semester in which the student enrolls for the 91st credit hour; normally about the second semester of the junior year)

3.   Prior to graduation (during the last semester of the student's program)

4.   One to three years after graduation

19

7

Methods of Assessment

The principal method of assessment will be the individual student file, or portfolio. A portfolio is pr cisely what the term suggests: a collection of a teacher's (of a teacher-in-prepa ation's) products that individually and collectively portray that teacher's attainment. A portfolio may consist of a large variety of entries, although in the study described in this paper, a good deal of guidance is provided in terms of what the entries should illustrate.

In recent years, portfolios have been used more widely in pre- and in-service teacher assessment (see, for example, Cray & Currie, 1992; Loakner, Cromwell, & O'Brien, 1985; Shulman, 1989). In contrast to the multiple-choice examination format by which teacher competency is often assessed on a large-scale basis, the portfolio approach views teaching as complex behavior involving "thought and action with regard to [learners], purposes, and content in particular contexts" (Shulman, 1989, p. 15). Several researchers (see, for example, Olhausen & Ford, 1990; Shulman, 1989) have found the portfolio approach to be an effective way to document growth and to provide a record of change. They have also argued that an assessment program based on a portfolio approach engenders a greater sense of autonomy and responsibility and helps to personalize the assessment process.

These portfolios will serve as a comprehensive data base from which to assess student learning during the major program. Again, however, it must be emphasized that in contrast to the most common use of portfolios--to assess the learning of individual students--in the study described in this paper portfolios serve as a primary database for the evaluation of the program itself.

All students, at the time of their declaration of a TESOL major, will be introduced to the portfolio concept: the assessment program, purposes of assessment, the portfolio and its contents, the means by which students will compile their portfolios, the process by which portfolios will be reviewed, and the confidentiality of the entire procedure will be explained. Although some exceptions may be warranted, completion of a portfolio will be a graduation requirement. Appendix B provides a listing of the types of material that will be part of each student's portfolio.

Analysis, Interpretation, and Reporting of Results

Data will be analyzed annually by a departmental committee, the members of which will serve staggered two-year terms. Prior to end of the Spring semester, a written report will be submitted by this committee to the Head of the Department, the English Senate, and the Department Curriculum Committee.

One of the major aims of the trialling period of the assessment plan is to discover how the data can best be used. The guiding principle of the departmental committee is that the value of the data collected depends on the quality of the questions that we want the data to answer. Among the questions that seem promising to explore are the following:

1.   What kind of work--library research, examinations, practice-oriented projects, homework assignments--do students submit to their portfolio to demonstrate attainment of particular competencies? (In the case of this and all succeeding questions, the necessary follow-up question will be, Are there differences in between the second and third assessment stages?)

2.   How much writing do students do in their major program? Are the courses in the program dominated by examinations, or do students have frequent and meaningful opportunities to produce written work?

3.   Is there evidence from the portfolios that certain sequences of courses would be more effective than others? For example, do recurrent shortcomings and deficiencies in the kind of work students produce in one course suggest the need for some other course to be taken first?

Current Status of the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan

A draft version of the Student Outcomes Assessment Plan was submitted to the University Student Outcomes Assessment Committee in December 1991. It was reviewed during the current (Spring 1992) semester; also during this semester, the departmental committee will conduct a trial implementation of the draft plan and will report the results of the trial and submit a revised plan to the University Committee by May 1992.

SELECTED OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE USE OF STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT AS A FOCAL COMPONENT OF AN ELT-PREPARATION PROGRAM

This model for the evaluation of an ELT teacher-preparation program is in the developmental and trial stage; it remains to be seen whether it proves fully practicable or indeed whether it is as useful as our initial judgments suggest. Our experience in developing a student outcomes assessment plan has led to a number of provisional observations about student outcomes assessment:

1.   It uses student outcomes--the knowledge base, skills, and values and attitudes--as a focal point for program evaluation: for the (re)formulation of aims, for the development of other components of systematic program evaluation.

2.   It promotes a developmental view of teacher preparation and growth.

Student outcomes assessment and the use of portfolios to assess those outcomes are based on the assumption that the structure of (teacher-preparation) programs requires that the process be repeated at several stages in the student's life cycle and continuing into the student's teaching career.

In this respect, outcomes assessment has the following advantages as an organizing component of program evaluation:

a.   Student outcomes assessment allows for -- and indeed encourages -- formative evaluation of a program, in the form of periodic assessment of student outcomes as a group of students moves through the program. Such a program also allows for timely evaluation of new elements introduced into a program.

b.   Student outcomes assessment encourages a developmental view of teacher preparation. It focuses on the emergence, over the history of a student in a teacher-preparation program and beyond that program into the first years of service, of professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes. This is especially important in undergraduate teacher preparation for English language teaching. Whereas students entering our and other M.A. programs have often had years of teaching experience, and whereas they usually have a fairly clear idea of what they hope to gain, in terms of increased marketability, from an M.A., undergraduate students often give the impression of having little idea of the nature of the field or of current

10

and future market conditions. We feel that it is important to tap, in as systematic a fashion as possible, the reasons why students declare a TESOL major: What has generated their interest in English language teaching? What are their expectations? How do they hope to use the credentials offered by the program?

Similarly, we feel that it is important to gauge the development of a professional awareness among students as they move through their academic preparation for a teaching career. Do students near the end of their preparation provide evidence of a perceptibly greater sense of what teaching is, or can be, than they did at the time of entry into the program? How well do they understand the nature of teaching? Do their perceptions near the end of their academic program coincide with or differ radically from their perceptions as in-service teachers?

Finally, we would like to have the insights of our program graduates. How do they view their professional preparation now that they are engaged in full-time teaching? What knowledge, skills, and other competencies do they feel were underrepresented in their program? What did they learn that is marginal to their work as teachers? What specific recommendations would they make for tailoring the program more closely to the demands of their current teaching position?

3.   Engages teachers-in-preparation as active agents in the processes of curriculum-evaluation and -renewal.

One of the strongest arguments for the use of a portfolio approach is that it requires the active participation of students. What do our teachers-in-preparation believe will demonstrate attainment of the competencies for each outcome? What work of theirs do they want in the portfolio?

It should also be pointed out that a limited number of students in the program currently serve as consultants to the departmental committee. They are helping to compile post hoc portfolios of their work to help test the feasibility of the portfolio approach and to assist in other aspects of the formative evaluation of the student outcomes assessment program. Our hope is that the participation of these students will have a ripple effect on the student population as a whole by helping to publicize the purposes and procedures of this initiative in program evaluation and by shaping the perception that this effort "belongs" to students themselves as much as it does to the teaching and administrative personnel.

4.   Builds habits of inquiry and a culture of evidence about student learning

Although a considerable portion of the data in the portfolios may not be easy to analyze, portfolios, however cumbersome they may be, do represent an effort to supplement intuition with empirical evidence. There is no shortage of opinion about what teacher preparation should be or about how effectively students are being prepared to handle the demands of classroom teaching; student outcomes assessment seeks to establish a preference for the systematic collection and comprehensive (as opposed to piecemeal) analysis of evidence.

5.   Reveals the interaction between top-down and bottom-up processes of curriculum renewal

Recent discussions of curriculum renewal have made use of a distinction between top-down and bottom-up processes. The former, also known as the centre-periphery, or power-coercive model, is the kind most closely associated with systems in which a central authority (for example, a Ministry of Education) issues directives (with or without guidance) to be implemented at the local level. The latter, a "grass roots" approach, involves change that is initiated at the local level in response to local needs, problems, or interests.

There has been a strong tendency to emphasize the inherent value of bottom-up initiatives in curriculum renewal. The work of Stenhouse (1975), for example, is widely quoted in our literature, and there is a strong belief in greater efficacy of curriculum renewal that has its origin within an institution rather than that which is imposed from above.

Our experience so far suggests what may be obvious: Top-down and bottom-up approaches are not discrete polar categories; if they are useful in identifying where the impetus for change originates, they do not portray how the two approaches can interact within the context of a particular effort at curriculum renewal.

For example, in the early stages of developing plans for trialling the draft version of the plan described in this paper, it was decided that we might use student outcomes assessment as a means for strengthening our links with in-service teachers who may or may not have done coursework at the University of Northern Iowa--teachers who in many cases had little or no formal training in teaching English to speakers of other languages, but who had been assigned to such classes anyway (a not uncommon occurrence in many areas of the United States[1]).

24

12

A presentation (Gates, 1992) at state-wide conference on teaching English as a second language included a workshop session in which in-service teachers helped to select survey and interview procedures that they felt would be most useful in tapping their insights about the kind of preparation that they would have liked to have and about the knowledge base, skills, and attitudes that they believe are necessary for successful teaching of English as a second language. Several of the workshop participants volunteered to participate in a survey and structured interview and to recruit additional respondents from among their colleagues from around the state.

This dimension of the program, although not directly concerned with student outcomes assessment itself, may be valuable in two ways: (a) by publicizing the program and the University's responsiveness to accountability, and (b) more important perhaps, by providing data that we would not otherwise be able to collect for several years (that is, until the group of students entering the program this year have completed their degree and are working in the field) and that can serve as a point of reference for our analysis of data collected from our own students and for our evaluation of the outcomes and competencies that have been used to create the very framework for the collection of data.

In short, we have taken a top-down directive and reshaped it to our own needs even while we have adhered to the minimum requirements of the directive. This is, we believe, a valuable illustration of the common phenomenon of top-down directives inspiring and being in their turn reshaped by the interests and needs of a local program.

CONCLUSION

In its Statement of Principles on Student Outcomes Assessment (1988), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges points out that "it takes time to design and institute effective assessment programs. A report by the College Outcomes Evaluation Program in New Jersey acknowledges that it may take ten years to fully implement the state's plan" (p. 4). The cautious attitude voiced in the NASULGC document is worth bearing in mind. Although the development of a program for on-going evaluation based on student outcomes assessment has been remarkably smooth so far, many questions have yet to be fully addressed. For example, although we are making provisions for having all students compile a portfolio, we have not ruled out the possibility that some form of sampling will be used to analyze the data in the portfolios. Programs with large student enrollments and/or with limited resources will certainly have to consider some form of

13

sampling. But beyond the practical problems surrounding the use of portfolios--the record-keeping, the need to educate students about the nature and purpose of portfolios, and the requirements for storage space and human resources to make effective use of the data in the portfolios--another issue looms. This is precisely the issue raised in the NASULGC Statement mentioned above: Will it be possible to sustain the initial enthusiasm for this innovation in the evaluation of teacher preparation? By its nature, student outcomes assessment--with or without the use of portfolios--must be on-going, and there is some concern about the ability of a committee with a continually rotating membership to maintain the level of energy needed for a useful analysis of student outcomes.

Despite these and other unresolved issues, we remain enthusiastic about the prospects for learning more about our ELT-preparation program through the assessment of student outcomes. In conjunction with other elements of a well-rounded scheme for systematic program evaluation, student outcomes assessment appears to have great potential to provide relevant data through a process that itself may have considerable positive backwash on the very individuals with whom we are concerned: our current and future teachers-in-preparation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

ALDERSON, J.C., & Beretta, A. (Eds). (1992). *Evaluating Second Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BOYER, C.M., & Ewell, P.T. (1988). *State-based Approaches to Assessment in Undergraduate Education: A Glossary and Selected References.* Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

BUTTERY, T., Haberman, M., & Houston, W. (1990). *First Annual ATE Survey of Critical Issues in Teacher Education.* Action in Teacher Education, 12(2), 1-7.

14

COOPER, J.M. (1983). *Basic Elements in Teacher Education Program Evaluation: Implications for Future Research and Development*. In K.R. Howey & W.E. Gardner (Eds.), The Education of Teachers: A Look Ahead (pp. XX-XX). New York: Longman.

CRAY, E., & Currie, P. (1992). *Innovations in a Pre-service Teacher Development Program*. Paper Presented at the 26th Annual TESOL Convention, Vancouver, March 3-7.

GAIES, S.J. (1992). *If I Knew Then What I Know Now: In-service Perspectives on Second Language Teacher Education*. Paper Presented at the Iowa Joint ESL/Bilingual and Refugee Concerns Conference, Des Moines, IA, February 19-20.

LANGE, D.L. (1990). *A Blueprint for a Teacher Development Program*. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (pp. 245-268). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LOAKNER, G., Cromwell, L., & O'Brien, K. (1985). *Assessment in Higher Education: To Serve the Learner*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 678)

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. (1988). *Statement of Principles on Student Outcomes Assessment*. Washington, DC: Author.

NUNAN, D. (1990). *Action Research in the Language Classroom*. In Richards, J.C., & Nunan, D. (Eds.), Second Language Teacher Education (pp. 62-81). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

OLHAUSEN, M., & Ford, M. (1990). *Portfolio Assessment in Teacher Education: A Tale of Two Cities*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 329 917)

SHULMAN, L. (1989). *The Paradox of Teacher Assessment: New Directions for Teacher Assessment*. In Proceedings of the ETS Invitational Conference (pp. 13-27). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

SHORT, E.C. (1987). *Curriculum Decision Making in Teacher Education: Policies, Program Development, and Design*. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(4), 2-12.

STENHOUSE, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.

TEACHERS of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1975). *Guidelines for the Certification and Preparation of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages in the United States*. Washington, DC: Author.

27 15

TEACHERS of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1984). *Statement of Core Standards for Language and Professional Preparation Programs.* Washington, DC: Author.

TEACHERS of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (1992). *TESOL Statement on the Preparation of Primary and Secondary Teachers in the United States.* TESOL Matters, 2(1), 5.

---

1.   Many individual states have only recently formulated licensure requirements for teaching English as a second language in public schools. In many states, including Iowa, the full effect of certification or endorsement requirements will not be felt until members of the current generation of (undertrained) teachers must renew their teaching certificates.

28   16

APPENDIX A

Student Outcomes Assessment Plan
University of Northern Iowa
Department of English Language and Literature

Bachelor of Arts: TESOL
Bachelor of Arts: TESOL--Teaching*

OUTCOMES AND COMPETENCIES

For All TESOL Degree Programs

Outcome 1   Students shall understand the structure of language, with particular emphasis on English.

    Competency 1.1 Be able to recognize and interpret basic features and processes of the phonological, morphological, semantic, and syntactic subsystems of English.

    Competency 1.2 Be familiar with fundamental concepts and procedures in the description and analysis of a language and with the application of linguistic description and analysis to the teaching and learning of a second or foreign language.

    Competency 1.3 Be aware of the different ways in which a language system can be analyzed and the relevance, for teaching English to speakers of other languages, of recognizing the formal, functional, and symbolic properties of language.

Outcome 2   Students shall be familiar with the principles and practices of teaching English to speakers of other languages.

    Competency 2.1 Be able to identify and distinguish different methods, program models, and approaches to syllabus design, curriculum and materials development, assessment, and program evaluation.

Competency 2.2 Be familiar with a range of procedures for planning and executing classroom instruction in English as a second/foreign language.

Competency 2.3 Be familiar with practices for continued professional growth.

Outcome 3 Students shall understand the process of language development.

Competency 3.1 Be conversant with substantive and methodological issues in first- and second-language acquisition research.

Competency 3.2 Be able to identify major findings of language-acquisition research and interpret their relevance to classroom teaching and learning of English as a second/foreign language.

Outcome 4 Students shall understand the interrelationship of language, society, and culture.

Competency 4.1 Understand basic concepts and principles of synchronic and diachronic variation.

Competency 4.2 Be familiar with the relationship between language and societal and cultural change and recognize the implications of this interrelationship for language teaching and learning.

Competency 4.3 Be familiar with the social psychological dimensions of language learning and use and their implications for language teaching and learning.

Outcome 5 Students shall be familiar with TESOL as a professional activity.

Competency 5.1 Be conversant with the history of teaching English to speakers of other languages in this century; the current status of TESOL as a recognized professional activity (e.g., in regard to certification, endorsement, and other licensing standards); and current standards for the development and evaluation of English as a second language programs.

Competency 5.2 Be able to access and use the literature and other resources in order to engage effectively in professional writing and other activities.

For TESOL-Teaching Only

Outcome 6   Students shall have supervised experience in observing, planning, and executing teaching and learning activities for an ESL classroom.

Competency 6.1 Demonstrate familiarity with and the ability to conform to the etiquette of teacher observation and supervision.

---

*The Department of English Language & Literature at UNI offers three different undergraduate majors in TESOL: (a) TESOL, (b) TESOL--Teaching, and (c) TESOL/Modern Language. The TESOL--Teaching major differs only slightly from the TESOL major and is intended for those students who plan to teach English as a second language in the public schools of Iowa or some other state. For the TESOL--Teaching major, a sixth outcome is included: "Students shall have supervised experience in observing, planning, and executing teaching and learning activities for an ESL classroom." This outcome supplements, but is not identical to, the supervised student teaching that all teaching majors at UNI must do to meet degree requirements.

In its review of the draft plan, the University Student Outcomes Assessment Committee called for clearer differentiation, if necessary, between the outcomes and competencies for the TESOL/Modern Language major and those for the other two majors. The departmental committee is currently addressing this issue.

19

APPENDIX B

STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PROGRAM
Description of Portfolio Contents

Portfolios will contain at least the following information:

1. **Declaration of major**

1.1   Final high school transcript
1.2   ACT/SAT scores
1.3   Registrar's degree audit
1.4   Declaration of major form
1.5   A letter of interest written by the student and addressing the following:

       Intended major(s)/minor(s) and reasons for seeking them
       Previous preparation and experience relevant to the major
       Awards and honors received
       Postgraduation career/education goals
       Expected relation between major and postgraduation goals

1.6   Any other materials relevant to the degree sought that the student wishes to submit

2. **Mid-program**

2.1   Registrar's degree audit
2.2   Such papers and examinations as students may feel reflect their having gained any competencies stipulated under the "outcomes" listed for their program. (The relation claimed between papers/examinations and relevant competencies will be indicated on a check-off sheet at the time the documents are entered, and the check-off sheet can then be used as a suggestive guide to the students' subsequent course of study.)

3. **Just before graduation**

3.1   Registrar's degree audit
3.2   Written assessments or performance evaluations from any practicum, cooperative experience, or similar activity
3.3   GRE, LSAT or similar examination scores if available
3.4   List of awards and honors received

3.5   Such papers and examinations as students may feel reflect their having gained any competencies stipulated under the "outcomes" listed for their program. (The relation claimed between papers/examinations and relevant competencies will be indicated on a check-off sheet at the time the documents are entered.)

4.   One to three years after graduation

4.1   Completed alumni survey