2. Curriculum

Curriculum Standard 1: The curriculum is consistent with the mission of the program or institution; appropriate to achieve the organization's goals and meet assessed student needs; and available in writing.

Section A Description of current operations to show how the standard is met.

Curriculum Philosophy

AUK's IEP offers a goal-oriented curriculum that supports and extends the IEP's Mission Statement. Since the beginning of operations, the IEP has and will continue the enhance and develop its curriculum in order to meet the learning outcomes identified within the IEP's Mission Statement in tandem with the evolving needs of the IEP's student constituents. As stated in the Mission Statement Standard 1, the IEP is committed to "prepare students … to gain sufficient mastery of the English language and successfully apply the critical thinking skills needed to excel as students both during and after their formal studies" (see Scope and Sequence Chart C-1-1).

The IEP follows the American model of higher education in its application of best teaching and learning practices that are specific to ESL learners and that are utilized in American post-secondary institutions. The IEP teaching and learning philosophy continuously integrates two distinct yet thoroughly integrated objectives in its curriculum:

1. Developing students' English language proficiency to the extent that they are capable of excelling in AUK's undergraduate program;

2. Developing the students' analytical and critical skills, leadership skills, personal as well as communal responsibility and accountability, and guiding them through personal growth experiences.

The IEP instills in students an understanding and appreciation of the cause-effect nature of their participation in the education system and their responsibility for their actions and learning.

Therefore, the IEP curriculum is designed to respond to, support, extend, and integrate the overall mission of the University with the IEP mission (see Proficiency Chart C-1-2). To this end, the curriculum material (Appendix A, pp. 121-168) is distributed in manageable increments among the three levels (and ENGL 099) and the different courses (Reading and Writing, Oral Communication) in the program as outlined specifically in Curriculum Standard 2. Each course has its own set of objectives, a description of the activities that will demonstrate mastery of and/or progress in each objective, evaluation methods, and materials required.

Furthermore, our programs encourage instructors to capitalize on their individual teaching methodologies in conjunction with best teaching practices and pedagogies, and utilize supplementary instructional materials as long as students meet the final learning outcomes of the course. Flexibility relative to delivery and instructional support materials allows practical professional development, and encourages a student-centered approach to teaching where teaching methods are tailored to specific student needs and demands.

The pedagogical flexibility that exists in the IEP program is undergirded by the need to adhere to consistency within the program and among the various sections of specific skill courses. The consistency is required in order to assure that students in each specific skill section acquire the same learning outcomes in order to reduce academic skill discrepancies among students as they move from level to level. The IEP achieves this consistency through a system of checks and balances that includes but is not limited to common major

assignments/exams and common criteria and rubrics (Appendix A. pp. 516-553) for evaluating those assignments. The IEP's means of monitoring this consistency includes but is not limited to norming sessions, mentoring, student evaluation of teaching, peer observation, Director/Coordinator/senior instructor evaluation, and course evaluation.

The balancing between instructor's ability to exercise professional freedoms in regards to methodologies, pedagogies and ancillary support materials, and the need for standardization has resulted in the IEP's ability to attain higher levels of academic integrity, the ability of the program to more accurately assess its students' abilities and deficiencies, as well as the curriculum's merits and deficiencies. It provides a transparent, accurate, foundational basis upon which the curriculum continues to develop.

History of Curriculum Change

The IEP's curriculum development was and still remains driven by student needs (Appendix A pp. 79-94). In 2004, AUK was only the second private institution in Kuwait that is modeled to an American system of higher education. Local student data relative to levels of English language proficiency was and still remains publically non-existent. Furthermore, student language needs, challenges and deficiencies were not documented in any of the public or private schools from which the University's recruitment took place, nor was the data provided by the Ministry of Higher Education appropriate to our needs in designing the initial program and curriculum. Within the context of a start-up, and the lack of necessary data, the IEP's initial goal was to develop a broad based curriculum that would be sufficiently flexible for the necessary developments that needed to occur once IEP was able to establish a history of student assessment and performance.

The table below represents a timeline detailing the causes and events that led to curricular changes and the nature of these changes (see IEP Annual Reports on site):

Semester	**Event**	**Curriculum Status**
Fall 2004	First courses offered by AUK IEP	-lacking necessary data, the IEP's initial goal was to develop a broad based curriculum that would be sufficiently flexible for developments that needed to occur once IEP was able to establish a history of student assessment and performance.
Spring 2005	Curriculum issues of Fall 2004 addressed	-embarking upon several strategic initiatives relative to curriculum development and course assessments. -maintaining the original curriculum for Level 1 and Level 2 curriculum through the spring semester. - adjusting the Level 3 curriculum as a means of determining future curricular developments throughout the program. -ACCUPLACER OnLine™ ESL.pro would be used to more accurately and systematically place IEP students into Levels 1,2,3.
Fall 2005	-Textbooks did not match levels -Shift in the exit criteria	-textbooks focus on academic skills. -20% for Exit Exam included in overall

	-Longman Interactive Program selected and purchased - Dartmouth advisors exposure to Literature	course grade implemented. -Longman Language Lab was implemented. -Reading Groups: Penguin Readers were assigned to each IEP level.
Spring 2006	-38% to 44% failure ratio ENGL 090 and ENGL 101	- development of Bridge Program ENGL 085/086/087. -curriculum mapping for all courses.
Fall 2006	-New Benchmarking for placement -Government scholarship student accepted at AUK -Dramatic expansion of IEP (from 200 to 400 students in IEP and Remedial English	- incorporate the new Bridge Program. -curriculum development project • Decision skills based curriculum • Detailed curriculum development • Exit criteria and material development for each course • Material folders developed -curriculum rewritten/curriculum mapping.
Spring 2007	-Ministry of Higher Education would not recognize ENGL 085/086/087 structure -government scholarship students 12 credit course remediation requirement	-development of ENGL 099 (12 credit) does not count towards degree program. - curriculum assessment change to portfolio for ENGL 099. -standardized Oral Communications course presentation. -coordinators develop standard Midterms and Final Exams.
Fall 2007	-New Benchmarks for placement -Student needs changed in UG to writing in response to something read	-eliminated placement of students who score less than 62 on the Accuplacer. - curriculum assessment change to portfolio for all Reading and Writing courses.
Spring 2008	-Continued expansion and need for fine-tuning curriculum standards	-coordinators develop and up-date course curricula. -coordinators develop and update tests and versions of tests. -IEP Library continues to expand -developed curriculum matrix.

Section B 1) documents in the report

IEP Mission Statement 2008-2009	www.auk.edu.kw/ Academic/Special Programs/Intensive English Program
Scope and Sequence Chart (Operations Manual pp.113-116)	C-1-1
Proficiency Chart (Operations Manual II Placement and Assessment pp. 46-47)	C-1-2
IEP Operations Manual Appendix J Rubrics pp. 516-553	Appendix A
Operations Manual IEP Curriculum IENG 010/011, IENG 020/021, IENG 030/031, ENGL 099 pp. 121-168	Appendix A
Operations Manual II Placement and Assessment, The Placement	Appendix A

Process p. 38	
Operations Manual IEP Curriculum Guidelines pp. 79-94	Appendix A

2) documents on site

IEP Annual Report 2004-2005 Textbooks & Curriculum p.2	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2004-2005 Curriculum development pp.5-13	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2004-2005 Attendance Policy p.14	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2004-2005 ACCUPLACER OnLine™ p.15	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2005-2006 Accuplacer added to grades, p. 12	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2005-2006 Reading Groups added to Lab p. 12	Director's Office
IEP Annual Report 2006-2007 Development of the Reading and Writing Curriculum pp. 6-43	Director's Office
ACCUPLACER OnLine™	www.accuplaceronline.com
Interview with curriculum coordinators, students, and faculty	
Classroom observations	

Section C Performance self-appraisal

The extent of the effectiveness and consistency of the curriculum with the mission and goals of the IEP can be measured according the IEP students' performance ratios in the undergraduate program upon matriculation from their respective undergraduate programs. As stated in Mission Standard 1, Section C, in summary, the retention rates of IEP students matriculating from respective undergraduate programs is 76%. The effectiveness and consistency of the curriculum with the mission and goals of the IEP is, therefore, "satisfactory."

The above is demonstrated using more specific methods of assessment used in the IEP program such as faculty surveys.

In a survey to ascertain the efficacy of the IEP curriculum, the results show that 83.3% of the IEP faculty agrees that the curriculum meets the goals of the Mission Statement, and the remaining 16.7% of the faculty remains ambivalent. Their reservation varies from the choice of textbooks to the irrelevance of some tasks and activities to the Mission Statement. One respondent commented that the academic writing taught is not in any current textbook and, thus poses the question as to whether there are no available textbooks around from which the program can be constructed. Another respondent was of the opinion that the program required fine tuning, and that it failed in promoting international-, intercultural- and self-understanding.

As to the question of whether or not the curriculum enables the students to meet the learning outcomes, 71.4% of the faculty agrees that it does and the remaining 28.6% has no firm opinion. Faculty opinions as to the causes of some of the challenges are diverse: For example, for IENG 031 and ENGL 099, one respondent considers in house generated handouts and sample essays inadequate to build a firm understanding by the students; another respondent considers the book series as merely reinforcing student skills addressed within individual textbooks, and failing to instill a broader language application.

Albeit these diverse faculty concerns, the survey confirms that Curriculum Standard I IEP curriculum philosophy is effective. Irrespective of its success in delivering the required

student learning outcomes, faculty opinions and concerns will be seriously taken into consideration in future curricular discussions and developments. Through faculty debate, discussion, and feedback, the IEP curriculum is able to make the adjustments necessary to maintain and improve upon the quality of the curriculum with regards to coherence, continuity and balance.

The feedback regarding the quality of the curriculum is determined by assessing student learning outcomes in a variety of ways such Student Evaluation of Teaching by student surveys, and ACCUPLACER Online™.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) has proven an effective mechanism in assessing the effectiveness of teaching methodologies and ancillary instructional materials. For example, the overall mean of the survey (scale 1-5) was 4.4 in Fall 2007 as shown below:

	Course Evaluation	Overall Program Mean
12	I can summarize an article accurately according to standard American English.	4.6
13	I can extend, expand, corroborate, refute, and synthesize a claim made by an author according to standard American English.	4.6
14	I can quote, paraphrase, and cite statements from a source accurately according to MLA in-text conventions according to standard American English.	4.6
15	I can analyze similarities and differences found in different adaptations of a work of literature according to standard American English.	4.5
16	I can discuss context and significance, recommend a relevant course of action, and/or predict according to standard American English.	4.5
17	Overall how would you rate the quality of this course?	4.4

Additionally, students who have completed an IEP semester must take an English proficiency test, ACCUPLACER OnLine™ (see ACCUPLACER Online™ on site), which evaluates reading comprehension and essay writing skills to place them into an appropriate English level for University. For the Level 3 Reading and Writing class, IENG-031, and the Fundamentals of English Class, ENGL-099, a portfolio of students' essays are evaluated by a team of IEP faculty readers to ensure an unbiased assessment of the students' ability to produce essays appropriate for University.

The current IEP curriculum meets the goals and the learning outcomes of the AUK and IEP Mission Statements as revealed in a recent survey. Nevertheless, the IEP philosophy in regards to curriculum and curriculum development supports continuous assessment and improvement, and is considered a work in progress as long as the AUK's IEP is operational. For example, concerns such as the promoting of international-, intercultural- and self-understanding in students will be considered, and attempts will be made to integrate it in developed student tasks and activities. The committee would also ensure continuity in methodology, content, evaluation and skill acquisition in order to achieve growth and development of both students and instructors.

The self-study required that the IEP develop a curriculum matrix that initially would present the various learning objectives and outcomes for each level in Reading and Writing and Oral Communication. It became apparent when assessing the matrix that the Oral Communication component between the levels was sufficiently linear and assured a smooth progression of language production. It was equally apparent that the discreet skills in the Reading and Writing process were not adequately distributed among the three levels.

Based on these findings, the requirement of a portfolio assessment in Level 3 was extended to all levels in the Reading and Writing component in order to fully integrate the process of

writing in all respective levels. For example, the research component in writing was historically restricted to Level 3. With the introduction of the portfolio assessment, basic research practices and skills have been introduced in levels 1 and 2.

Section D Recommendations, plan of action, timeline and persons responsible

There are no plans for any changes at this area.

Curriculum Standard 2: Course goals and objectives are written and are appropriate for the curriculum.

Section A Description of current operations to show how the standard is met.

The IEP's curriculum philosophy is designed to respond, support and extend the IEP's Mission Statement, and is articulated in the Operations Manual as the Curriculum Statement on page 79.

As reflected in the Curriculum Statement, the IEP's curriculum is predicated on four interrelated and interdependent foundational components:

1. Acquisition of language skills;
2. Acquisition of learning skills;
3. Delivery of suitable and appropriate instructional material;
4. Utilization of suitable and appropriate teaching methodologies and pedagogies.

The Operations Manual contains a full version of the IEP curriculum: detailed course descriptions, specific curriculum objectives, student learning outcomes, target behaviors, evaluation standards, and recommended materials (see course description in Catalog 2008-2008 pp. 270-271). In order to meet the academic demands of University study, the IEP provides a fully developed curriculum constructed on three staggered, interrelated, and interdependent levels in which students receive instruction and practice in reading, writing, listening, speaking, vocabulary, and grammar in order to attain fluency and accuracy. The IEP curriculum emphasizes independent language learning, academic preparation, and language production (see Major Goal M-1-1).

Student Awareness of Goals, Objectives, and Learning Outcomes

Students are made aware of course goals, objectives, and expected student learning outcomes via the syllabus, which also provides specific assignment objectives and outcomes; these assignment objectives and outcomes further appear in the individual assignment instructions and are communicated in the assignment progress evaluation sheets (see Scope and Sequence Chart C-1-1).

Interrelation, Sequence, and Goals of the General Curriculum

The curriculum (and the textbooks used to present the curriculum (C-2-1) is staggered upon three (3) consecutive levels, and each staggered level is categorized into two interdependent components:

1. The Reading and Writing segment;
2. The Oral Communication segment.

The goals and the respective skills necessary to achieve each level in the Reading and Writing components of the curriculum are as follows and outlined in the syllabus (see sample IENG 011 Reading and Writing Syllabus C-2-2):
Goals for the three (3) Levels respectively:

Level 1: to produce a portfolio of writing that demonstrates readiness to continue intensive English instruction in critical reading and writing at the high-intermediate level.

Level 2: to produce a portfolio of writing that demonstrates readiness to continue intensive English instruction in critical reading and writing at the advanced level.

Level 3 and ENGL 099: to produce a portfolio of writing that demonstrates readiness to begin University credit courses.

The skills necessary for students to achieve Levels 1, 2 and 3 goals are attained through the following means:

- Practice paraphrasing and summarizing multi-paragraph texts accurately
- Practice analyzing the perspectives and arguments presented by a variety of sources
- Practice synthesizing information from a variety of sources
- Practice evaluating ideas presented in multi-paragraph texts
- Learning to integrate their own ideas and experiences into the topics discussed in multi-paragraph texts
- Learn to attribute, cite, and document information from a source accurately according to MLA conventions
- Practice composing sentences free of serious grammatical and mechanical errors

The IEP sequence of courses meticulously and wholeheartedly embraces the concept identified by Bruner as "spiral learning":

"A curriculum as it develops should revisit…basic ideas repeatedly, building upon them until the student has grasped the full formal apparatus that goes with them" (Bruner, J. S. (1960). The Process of Education, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; second edition, 1977).

and amplified by Reigeluth, who labels the process "elaboration:"

"[Instruction] begins with the simplest version of the task that is still fairly representative of the task as a whole, then it teaches progressively more complex versions of the task until the desired level of complexity is reached, making sure that the learner is made explicitly aware of the relationship of each version to the other versions" (Reigeluth, C.M. (1999) The Elaboration Theory: Guide for Scope and Sequence Decisions. In C.M. Reigeluth (ed.) Instructional-Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory, vol. II. (pp. 425-453). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

With small but significant differences, the course objectives for all levels of IEP Reading and Writing are the same. All courses focus on

1. Instilling in students the reading skills necessary for them to execute the response-to-written-text writing activities that remain at the core of university work and on

2. Practicing incrementally those types of writing activities.

However, it is in the student learning outcomes that the gradations from level to level become apparent.

With regard to reading skills, students in a Level 1 Reading and Writing course, for example, begin to summarize multi-paragraph texts, identifying a writer's main idea, primary supporting points, and overall mode of discourse. Instruction in these skills recurs in Level 2 but with increased difficulty in material reading level and more analytical depth. In Level 1, students are asked to identify a piece of writing as using either addition or time order; in Level 2, students are asked to further refine that identification. If the piece uses addition order, is it in the form of comparison/contrast, cause/effect, classification, or enumeration? If the piece primarily uses time order, is it in the form or narration or process analysis? The skills recur in Level 3/ENGL 099, but added to the heuristic are analysis of a writer's purpose and tone.

A similar spiraling, or elaboration, occurs in the content, skills, and structures required of writing assignments from level to level: all courses have as an objective that "students will learn to integrate their own ideas and into the topics discussed in multi-paragraph texts."

In Level 1 this manifests itself in students being required to react to a text in free-form association: How does this make you feel? Have you ever seen an example of this idea/behavior/problem, etc.?

In Level 2 it manifests itself in students being required to provide a narrative example from their own experience or observation that supports a writer's claim: What have you experienced or seen that proves the writer is correct?

In Level 3/ENGL 099 it manifests itself in students being required to provide not only a narrative that supports the writer's claim but also another narrative that in some way challenges that claim.

Goals for each level of Reading and Writing courses are based on the supposition that

1. Students enter Level 1 at the low-intermediate to intermediate level and can progress sufficiently within one term to continue intensive English instruction in critical reading and writing at the high-intermediate level, that
2. Students enter Level 2 at the high-intermediate level and can progress sufficiently within one term to continue intensive English instruction in critical reading and writing at the advanced level, and that
3. Students enter Level 3/099 at the advanced level and can progress sufficiently within one term to begin university credit courses which require adequate academic language fluency in reading and writing.

The goals and the respective skills necessary to achieve each level in the Oral Communication component of the curriculum are as follows and outlined in the syllabus:

Goals for the three (3) Levels respectively:

Level 1: to perform academically-oriented listening and speaking skills at the intermediate level and to apply oral vocabulary, grammar, and fluency through a variety of communicative activities including pair work, presentations, and interviews.

Level 2: to perform academically-oriented listening and speaking skills at the high-intermediate level and to apply oral vocabulary, grammar, and fluency through a variety of communicative activities including pair work, presentations, and interviews.

Level 3: to perform academically-oriented listening and speaking skills at the low-advanced level and to apply oral vocabulary, grammar, and fluency through a variety of communicative activities including pair work, presentations, and interviews.

The skills necessary for students to achieve Levels 1, 2 and 3 goals are attained through the following means:

- Refine spoken grammatical accuracy through a variety of both written and oral grammar exercises and practices;
- Prepare short individual presentations with structural guidance;
- Listen for content in short academic lectures;
- Verbally respond to listening texts;
- Develop academic vocabulary through a variety of contextual exercises;
- Take notes in preparation for note-taking during lectures;
- Engage in academic conversation/discussion on a variety of academic topics.

All three levels of IEP Oral Communications prepare IEP students to take notes, and present information orally. In addition, all three levels of Oral Communications strive to increase the students' academic vocabulary, refine their grammar, improve their speaking skills and develop their listening skills. Although course objectives are almost the same in all three levels, the learning outcomes differ in difficulty and expectations. At all levels, students are expected to give four presentations.

In Level 1, students become familiar with platform skills and basic organization for their presentations. The focus is on basic organizational structure and the ability to use simple language with relative fluency. Thus, the topics of choice typically involve more immediate experiences that are familiar to students' such as biographical accounts, and narrations about self and classmates. Level 1 students are not expected to use technical or academic language at this level, but they will be required to use transition words in their presentations. Students are expected to use general language at this level, although academic or more ambitious language is not discouraged. Presentations are typically 2-4 minutes long with a fifth optional make-up presentation.

In Level 2, the emphasis is on more complex organizational skills and further development of presentations; also the presentations are longer, 4-6 minutes. The students are expected to research more and give more detailed information. Level 2 students commence with a narrative presentation which relates a humorous event in their life and some reflection on a lesson they learned from the event. This is to re-familiarize the students with platform skills and organization of materials, and introduces them to deductive analytical thinking processes. Consequently, students are asked to engage in research in preparation for a demonstration during which they are responsible for writing instructions. The goal is to expose students to process organization. Level 2 students are also required to give two informative presentations utilizing some of the rhetorical methods such as comparison and contrast, and classification as a form of elaboration and/or support. At this juncture, research will be introduced to students. Although this type of presentation is used in Level 1, students will be required to speak longer, give more information and cite sources during the presentation. Furthermore, organizational structures are more complex and require that students provide support and/or evidence for the ideas that they present. Level 2 students are expected to use a more expansive vocabulary, pay attention to word choices, and integrate academic vocabulary. Their use of transition words should start to show signs of mastery.

The Level 3 presentations, which are 6-8 minutes long, challenge students with higher levels of thinking built upon their basic ability to demonstrate platform and organizational skills. Level 3 begins with a narrative presentation related to a significant event in their life which requires analytical and critical thinking, and demands a significant astuteness in vocabulary. Moreover, because the structure for a narrative is familiar to most students, this will not be too challenging for students entering Level 3, and students new to IEP will not be overwhelmed by task overload. For their second presentation, students will be required to deliver a technical or academically based presentation with a strong emphasis on audience needs. Therefore, students will be challenged to explain complicated concepts to the audience by simplifying them to meet the audience's needs. Level 3 students will also have to give a causal presentation where they explain a cause and effect relationship. Finally, students in Level 3 must be able to give a persuasive presentation in which they identify a local problem, explain the situation, and propose and defend a feasible solution. Here the students are moving away from just presenting information and giving reflections to arguing a point. This presentation allows students to show their awareness about local issues while giving them a voice to express their concerns and hopes. In addition, by defending their solution, they are given the opportunity to explore different sides, thus increasing their

awareness and developing appreciation for diversity. Level 3 students will be able to use language appropriate for an academic setting and show mastery of transition words.

It should be noted that many of the presentations not only use spiral learning within the oral communications classes but also reinforce the reading and writing classes. The presentations require students to organize content to particular modes such as narrative, process, compare/contrast, causal effects, and definition/classification; as well as according to desired tone, and according to whether it is informative or persuasive.

Note taking and, consequently, listening skills not only increases in difficulty between the levels in terms of time, vocabulary and grammar, but also increases in its expectations of the students' ability to organize information, to select noteworthy material, and to use their notes. For example, note taking skills in:

> Level 1 requires students to listen to intermediate lectures 3- 7 minutes long and fill in gaps to pre-written notes to help accurately complete notes which are required to answer questions.
>
> Level 2 progresses to slightly longer intermediate to high-intermediate lectures which are 4-8 minutes long and students must complete larger gaps in pre-written notes. These gaps are large enough to require the student to organize parts of the lectures. These notes are required for accurately paraphrasing short sections of the lecture as well as answering questions.
>
> In Level 3, students are required to listen to high intermediate to low-advanced lectures 6-9 minutes long and take notes with little or no help. At this stage, students are expected to be able to organize information they hear, and discern what information is important to take for notes. Again, the notes are to be used to answer questions and for paraphrasing; however, the sections to paraphrase are more extensive.

By using common curriculum mapping and a curriculum matrix, the IEP can prevent unplanned repetition of skills, content or structure. The curriculum matrix indicates where the curriculum addresses each learning outcome and at what level a working ability is reached by the student (Curriculum Matrix C-2-3).

Academic Readiness

Student learning outcomes are observed and measured primarily in the Reading and Writing courses through the final portfolio submitted by students at the end of the term; the criteria and rubric for evaluating portfolios at all levels are provided to students both at the beginning and prior to submission of the final portfolio. However, at regular, prescribed points throughout a term, learning outcomes are observed and measured by the submission of what are termed "progress drafts" of specific writing assignments. These drafts are evaluated using a common, assignment-specific evaluation sheet and rubric. Faculty evaluate the progress of not only their own students' work but that of up two additional faculty members' students. Regular and mandatory norming sessions for faculty prior to the evaluation of progress drafts ensure consistency in the application of the rubrics. In addition, four "progress" reading tests (the first of which is in fact a diagnostic test given in the first days of the term) are used to observe and measure students' progress with the discrete reading skills focused on in a level; these tests are evaluated departmentally (no instructor evaluates his/her own students' progress tests) according to an agreed-upon answer key.

Students' learning outcomes in Oral Communications are observed and measured through the use of common rubrics and band scales for presentations. Generally throughout the levels,

the presentations require more time, more academic vocabulary, higher-level thinking and more structured organization.

For example, it is expected that undergraduate students are capable of responding in writing to undergraduate-level writing prompts, research, and reading materials. The effectiveness of the program is demonstrated by undergraduate program records in areas of student matriculation, grade-point average, retention, and graduation (Appendix A, pp.79-94).

Section B 1) documents in the report

Operations Manual III Curriculum Statement p. 79	Appendix A
Introduction IEP Mission Statement and Goals (Operations Manual Introduction p. 3)	M-1-1
Scope and Sequence Chart (Operations Manual pp.113-116)	C-1-1
List of textbooks for all levels (Banner Self-Service)	C-2-1
Syllabus Level 1 Reading and Writing (IENG 011) (Operations Manual pp. 345-352)	C-2-2
Curriculum Matrix (Operations Manual pp.103-112)	C-2-3
Operations Manual IEP Curriculum Guidelines pp. 79-94	Appendix A

2) documents on site

Catalog 2008-2009 Course Descriptions pp. 270-271	Director's Office
Sample weekly course planning guides	M:Drive/Courses/Lesson Plans
Sample textbooks	Director's Office
Individual syllabus	M:Drive/Courses/Syllabus
Curriculum survey results	M:Drive/Administration/Surveys

Section C Performance self-appraisal

The curriculum is sufficiently comprehensive for students to achieve the stated program goals and objectives, and effective procedures are continuously used to keep the curriculum up-to-date. Overall, the course goals and objectives correlate with the learning outcomes and are effective; levels are sequenced, and students and teachers respond positively to the curriculum.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (rate 1-5) on the course curriculum, which measures student responses to learning outcomes, objectives, and other course-related items overall was 4.41.

	Course Evaluation	Level 1 Mean	Level 2 Mean	Level 3 Mean	Overall Program Mean
8	The course requirements were clearly stated in the course syllabus.	4.01	4.31	4.57	4.35
9	The course objectives were clearly stated in the course syllabus.	3.98	4.25	4.57	4.33
10	The tests covered the material taught in the class.	4.17	2.28	4.56	4.40
11	Class time was used effectively.	4.03	4.23	4.32	4.28
12	I can summarize an article accurately according to standard American English.	4.31	4.20	4.43	4.27
13	I can extend, expand, corroborate, refute, and synthesize a claim made by an author according to standard American English.	4.27	4.08	4.51	4.32
14	I can quote, paraphrase, and cite statements from a source accurately according to MLA in-text conventions and to standard American English.	3.95	4.32	4.54	4.23
15	I can analyze similarities and differences found in different adaptations of a work of literature according to standard American	3.93	4.19	4.49	4.25

	English.				
16	I can discuss context and significance, recommend a relevant course of action, and/or predict according to standard American English.	4.06	4.36	4.32	4.24
17	Overall how would you rate the quality of this course?	4.27	4.36	4.49	4.41

If adjustments are required (for example: between Levels 2 and 3 there appeared to be a gap. Level 2 classes are introducing an essay, while Level 3 is asking them to produce very complex essays.) the Director, Curriculum Coordinator and Reading and Writing Coordinator meet and evaluate the problem and setup procedures for change.

Our system of standardized quizzes, mid-terms, finals, portfolios and exit exams across levels are specifically designed according to course goals, objectives and learning outcomes. The standardization allows faculty to monitor and chart student progress throughout the program. The Director, Curriculum Coordinator, Reading and Writing Coordinator, and faculty work together to ensure course objectives correlate with evaluations.

One measure of the effectiveness of the IEP curriculum is the GPA's of former IEP students at the undergraduate level. This demonstrates that the students are able to progress from IEP to the undergraduate level.

Another indication is the high ratio of students who accomplish the goals and objectives at each level and are promoted to the next level. This indicates that a large percentage of our students are able to progress successfully from one level to the next, and the goals and objectives flow from one level to the next. It clearly defines that the curriculum is effective and manageable by the majority of students.

A source of feedback was a survey taken by the majority of the IEP faculty during the Spring semester 2008. The faculty was asked to evaluate the curriculum by the following standards: goals and objectives correlate to the student learning outcomes, skills at each level flow smoothly from one level to the next, and IEP students are well prepared for undergraduate courses.

The first result of the survey indicated 80 % of the instructors felt that goals and objectives were in-line with learning outcomes while 20 % were neutral, and none disagreed. This is a clear indication that the majority of faculty is satisfied with the goals and objectives of the curriculum.

Comments:

- In regards to the courses that have been taught this year, the course goals and objectives correlate.
- The course goals and objectives have always been adapted to correlate with outcomes.
- In terms of each discrete course, the goals and objectives relate to the specific outcomes of each course.

Next, the IEP students are ready for undergraduate studies. This question's results may seem a little distorted with 53% being neutral, and approximately half of the faculty felt they did not have enough information; therefore, they were unable to make a factual analysis. Comparing the remainder of the instructors' responses, 41% felt that they were preparing the students for undergraduate studies and 6% disagreed. Overall, the IEP prepares students adequately for undergraduate studies with a few frustrations by individual instructors.

Comments:

- I think so but can't be sure without seeing the students' undergraduate course or receiving feedback from undergraduate professors.

- I've talked to IEP graduates and they said IEP has adequately prepared them for the undergraduate classes but we have no solid statistics.
- I think this a question only the students could answer.
- I don't know the UG syllabi changes from instructor to instructor. The UG does not have a unified syllabus for each course.
- Depends on individual students.
- If the student has taken advantage of the course to enhance their writing, the UG faculty feel the student is better prepared.

The only area of the curriculum that pointed toward some concern was the flow of skills from one level to the next. The research demonstrated that 33% were confident that the skills flowed from one level to the next, 27 % were neutral and 40% disagreed. Examining the responses to the questionnaire, we discovered that there was a positive consensus that skills did flow smoothly between levels 1 , 2, and 3 Oral Communications, and levels 1 and 2 Reading and Writing, but the level 3 Reading and Writing was different. The responses targeted areas in which adjustments could be made to structure a smooth flow in skills from Level 2 to Level 3.

Comments:

- The disconnect between Level 2 and Level 3 Reading and Writing leaves large gaps that put a burden on L3 instructors, which in turn puts and equivalently large burden on students.
- I believe the skills taught in the different levels are appropriate for a smooth flow.
- There seems to be a gap between Level 2 and Level 3 reading and writing.
- I have to be neutral as I have only taught 099.
- I strongly agree with this because in IEP there's a progression of tasks and skills from level to level. The higher the level, the harder the tasks. For example, the writing course smoothly progresses from sentence writing in Level 1 to paragraph writing in level 2 and finally essay writing in different genres in Level 3 and 099 classes.
- Level 1 and 2 flow smoothly.
- Much effort has gone into the creation of the new curriculum to ensure a smooth flow between levels over the previous curriculum.

The curriculum is sufficiently effective to achieve the goals and objectives of the IEP. The curriculum appraisal reflects current knowledge of strengths and weaknesses and ensures effective procedures are in place to continuously review, reflect and update the curriculum.

During the self-study, the decision was made by Michael McMurray, the Reading and Writing Coordinator, to review and revise the learning outcomes, course objectives, and course goals for all the levels of reading and writing. He subsequently made the necessary adjustments to the learning outcomes of level's 1 and 2 in order to prepare the students for the demands of Level 3. The curriculum changes were effective Summer 2008.

Section D Recommendations, plan of action, timeline, persons responsible.

There are no plans for any changes in this area.

Curriculum Standard 3: The instructional materials and methodologies are appropriate and contribute to the mastery of course objectives.

Section A Description of the current operations to show how the standard is met.

Methodologies and Instructional Strategies

There is an ongoing effort to match the instructional materials with the needs of the students and the curriculum, and the teaching styles of the IEP faculty. The faculty is encouraged to use a variety of ESL methodologies (Appendix A, pp.79-85) to achieve the course objectives and goals within the parameters of the IEP curriculum and the Kuwaiti culture. Our focus in our materials and methodologies is twofold: 1) Academic 2) Communicative. Our students are required to learn how to comprehend academic texts and lectures in English as well as communicate their own analyses and syntheses in speaking and in writing. Since the majority of our students are from government high schools where English is not the medium of instruction, our IEP instructors provide a supportive environment that promotes scaffolding skills in the lower levels and encourages independence with minimal guidance in the upper levels (see sample lesson plans C-3-1).

There are a variety of methodologies the instructors utilize and apply within the classroom to engage the students in learning activities. One method used by instructors is task-based instruction, in which students participate in communicative tasks in English. Tasks are defined as activities that can stand alone as fundamental units and that require comprehending, producing, manipulating, or interacting in authentic language while attention is principally paid to meaning rather than form. In addition, some of the instructors use the Cognitive Academic Language Learning approach founded on cognition which focuses on direct learning strategy instruction and the growth of critical thinking to gain reflective stages of language ability. For example, Task-Based Instruction and Cognitive Academic Language Learning are combined in the IEP:

Writing assignments in the IEP require an even integration of both Task-Based Instruction and the Cognitive Academic Language Learning approach. Here, students must be guided toward attaining specific declarative knowledge, particularly of terminology, prior to being set on a path toward producing pieces of writing that demonstrate specifically articulated abilities. For example, before a student can attempt to compose the Extension/Expansion Essay, he/she must first be instructed in the specific contextual meanings of the terms <u>extension</u> and <u>expansion</u>. With that declarative knowledge in place, the student can then embark upon creating a product that fulfills the requirements of that assignment. The creating of the Extension/Expansion product is conducted in a collaborative laboratory environment wherein the instructor guides and oversees the students' work with one another in composing similar yet distinctive final products. This integrated method is utilized in the production of all pieces of writing comprising the portfolio, and as the course progresses, the metacognition component of the Cognitive Academic Language Learning approach is activated in that students are referred back to, and are required to recall, terminology and processes from previous assignments and apply them to the subsequent tasks.

The primary consideration in the decision to use an instructional strategy is whether or not the methods and materials are in alignment with the learning expectations. If students are expected to learn to perform something, the strategies must provide the opportunity for 'performance;' if students are expected to integrate ideas or become critical thinkers, the strategies must provide the opportunity for students to integrate and be critical.

To meet the demanding standards of an American university housed in a Kuwaiti society under both the guidance of Dartmouth University (See Memorandum of Understanding on

the Website) and the policies of the Private University Council of Kuwait (the accreditation agency for Kuwait), we have found it necessary to standardize texts, syllabi, midterm and final exams in order to assess student progress and to encourage accountability to the objectives and goals of the program by all participants (student and instructors alike). However, supplementary material and quizzes are the responsibilities of each instructor and are tailored to the needs of each individual class. Many instructors choose from the IEP ESL library (library resource list is located on M:Drive) and the list of suggested texts for each level, as well as utilize the supplementary material provided by the publishers of the required texts available on hard copy and the shared M:Drive.

Diagnostic tests have been incorporated to confirm that the new incoming student is ready for that level (C-3-2). If an incoming student has been misplaced, there is an opportunity to advance to the next level with administrative approval. For students advancing through the IEP levels, the diagnostic test scores also provide instructors with an insight as to student readiness for the present level, although approval for skipping a level is not advised. Tutoring is advised for low scoring IEP students, and the early warning that diagnostic tests provide is a great asset to the instructor as well as the student.

Instructional Material

Proposed instructional materials must exhibit a coherent content framework that is aligned with student learning outcomes. Instructional material is carefully and deliberately selected by the program accordingly. Curriculum descriptions for each course in the Operations Manual include lists of present required materials previewed by the IEP faculty. Instructors are encouraged to provide input on how texts are working in the classroom and provide their own recommendations for the following year at the middle and end of the term meetings.

One of the most important decisions faced by instructors and coordinators is the selection of instructional resources that ensure or enhance instruction. Normally, the instructor uses the core learning material for 70% of the assigned tasks and supplementary and/or technological materials for 30% of the course. The implementation of the curriculum adopted by the program is the responsibility of the instructor who in turn is responsible for student learning. This requires that the instructor moves beyond the resources provided, if necessary, in order to develop active, motivating learning experiences for students. When choosing instructional materials, instructors and coordinators should choose materials on the basis of their contributions to the learning outcomes rather than on the basis of the availability of instructional materials or ease of use.

The instructional materials should relate directly to the purpose and objective of the lesson; extend content or provide for remediation, reinforcement, or enrichment. They should be appropriate to student differences such as academic ability, achievement, interests, and learning styles. Therefore, regardless of the instructional method used in the classroom, instructors and coordinators must consider each of the following before selecting instructional resources:

- The objectives: What skills/concepts do the lesson objectives specify for mastery?
- The students: How many students are there? What are their general characteristics (such as proficiency level) as well as previous experience, and any special needs they may have? What specific knowledge or skills do they already have? What are their learning styles and preferences? For instance, do they prefer audio materials, visuals, interpersonal experiences, or hands-on learning?

- The learning environment: Is the space large enough to allow instructors to conveniently divide the students into small groups? Will it allow the students to work individually without distractions?
- The available resources: What resources are available (including materials, equipment, etc.)? What are the instructor's limitations? How much time would the use of a particular resource require? Does the resource have assignments and activities that facilitate participation and communication among students?
- Materials selected for student use should be consistent with the students' levels of comprehension, ability and responsibility and incorporate scaffolding techniques in the exercises (i.e., controlled to guided to free exercises).

Instructors and/or coordinators identify learning materials suitable to the student learning outcomes (see Level 1 Reading and Writing Syllabus C-2-2). For example, in the selection of reading learning material, the instructors and/or coordinators should determine areas of student interest, predict the students' reading level, or determine the material's readability. The extent of the compatibility between the student and material should be evaluated in terms of reading level, interest, word recognition, and comprehension. Once a consensus is reached by the instructors and coordinator, the learning material is piloted in at least one class to determine its suitability in enhancing the learning outcomes. The coordinators are charged with final selection of instructional material (see sample report to director on site).

New learning materials (i.e. texts, CDs, videos, etc.) are previewed by the coordinators throughout the academic year and possible alternatives that may better meet the curriculum objectives, goals, and learning outcomes are circulated among the faculty. Written and oral comments are taken into consideration and recommendations are made by the Curriculum Coordinator to the Director if the majority of faculty agrees. All comments are documented. For example, different learning materials contribute to student learning and the achievement of program goals and support activities outside the classroom in the IEP:

The Townsend Press/John Langan series of reading texts approaches the instruction of reading by focusing on discrete reading skills that students apply to the reading and writing tasks of the sequence of IEP reading and writing courses and that they can apply to any content area or discipline following completion of the IEP program. By consciously learning to identify a writer's purpose, tone, mode of discourse, main idea, and primary supporting points, students acquire a heuristic that they use in order to compose the summary paragraph for each major writing assignment; with this heuristic, they can apply it to the comprehension and summarizing of texts in subsequent courses beyond IEP and beyond the University. Similarly, by consciously learning to distinguish between fact and opinion, to make inferences, and to evaluate the relevance of evidence, students develop critical thinking skills that they use to discover, analyze, and discuss information as required by the comparison/contrast assignments, the corroboration/refutation assignment, and the synthesis component of the literary analysis assignment. These critical thinking skills are required of students in post-IEP courses and enable students to excel in higher-level thinking and analysis situations beyond the University.

The Townsend Press series of vocabulary texts, designed to correspond directly to the reading skills series, offers students the opportunity to better comprehend the material in the reading series and to build and, moreover, to own high-frequency academic vocabulary which they will encounter and be expected to use in post-IEP coursework and professional situations beyond the University.

The in-house-generated writing assignment worksheets have been designed to take students through all stages of the writing in aid of completing assignments to be included in the

portfolio. This is also true for presentation worksheets in oral communications, since the worksheets guide students through preparation and development of their presentations. While the particular IEP assignment worksheets are of no direct use to students in terms of later University assignments, or in writing or speaking activities beyond the University, the process they require of students to engage in while completing IEP assignments provides students with a heuristic that serves them in any writing situation or formal speaking situation they encounter post-IEP.

Instructor resources are available in the Director's office or can be ordered through the AUK Bookstore. Students purchase their texts at the AUK Bookstore. Additional student learning materials are available in the IEP Lab or the AUK Library.

Instructional Technologies

To supplement the textbooks that are generally required for each course, instructors can access additional instructional media or Internet material from a wide variety of sources:

- AUK website/Intensive English Program/English Practice Websites online (see English Practice website)
- IEP Computer Lab - Longman Interactive Software
- Audio/Video material available in the IEP Library (see IEP Library selection on site)
- Video material available in the AUK Library (see library media selection on site)
- Projectors/CD and Cassette Players/Television/DVD Players
- Turn-It-In.com

Instructional technologies assist in achieving IEP goals and objectives in multiple ways. Support materials that accompany texts provide both interactive and non-interactive supplementary exercises that serve to consolidate material, concepts, and skills covered in class related to reading, writing, listening, speaking, grammar, and vocabulary. Other independent instructional technologies contribute to the program in accordance with their stated purposes:

- ETS's writing program Criterion encourages students to revise their writing by providing instant feedback in response to specific, ETS-generated writing prompts, and to instructor-generated prompts as well;
- The Turn-It-In.com Website assists instructors and students to in encouraging academic honesty;
- AUK Library data bases provide not only resources for student use but opportunities to practice information-locating techniques;
- Video/DVD versions of adapted novels provide the basis for comparative analysis;
- Computers are widely used both in and out of the classroom: instructors project exercises, reading passages, model essays, and student samples of writing via Microsoft Office;
- Instructors regularly communicate with students via email regarding their status in a course and respond to emailed drafts with suggestions for revision and editing.

Section B 1) documents in the report

Operations Manual III Curriculum, Methodologies, pp. 79-85	Appendix A
Sample Lesson Plans Level 3 Reading and Writing (M:Drive/Courses/ Lesson Plans)	C-3-1
Memorandum of Understanding	www.auk.edu.kw
Diagnostic in-class testing (Operations Manual II Placement and Assessment, p. 51)	C-3-2

Syllabus Level 1 Reading and Writing (IENG 011) (Operations Manual pp. 345-352)	C-2-2
AUK video selection	www.auk.edu.kw/ Academics/Library/ Library Selection
English Practice	www.auk.edu.kw /Academics/Special Programs/Intensive English Program/English Practice

2) documents on site

Instructor resources/CD/ Cassettes /video List	M:Drive/Administration/IEP Library-Resources
IEP Library Resources (Textbooks, books, videos, CD's & cassettes)	Director's Office
Instructor-created materials	M:Drive/Courses/(individual courses)
Program textbooks	Director's Office
University Library	Central Campus
Classroom observations	

Section C Performance self-appraisal

The results of the curriculum survey conducted found that faculty members are able to use a wide variety of teaching methodologies that they feel correlate to the course goals/objectives and students' learning outcomes and needs. The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed, 30% strongly agree and 61% agree, whereas 7% were neutral.

There seems to be an agreement among faculty members that the instructional materials (including but not limited to current texts, supplementary materials, online resources, and tests/exams) enable students to meet the learning outcomes. The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed, 23% strongly agree and 61% agree, 7% are neutral, and 7% disagree.

Faculty members agree that they have sufficient access to sufficient instructional materials when/if needed. The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed 66% strongly agree and 33% agree.

Instructional materials include but are not limited to materials available online, personal resources, the IEP Library, the AUK Library, and the M:Drive. Coordinators and faculty members do an excellent job of guiding and providing each other with supplementary materials when/if needed.

While some faculty members agree that they have the opportunity to discuss and provide adequate feedback on issues of curriculum, materials, and methodologies, many see the need for this process to be formalized, documented, and taken into consideration. One faculty member suggests forming a "formal curriculum committee." The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed, 35% strongly agree, 28% agree, 7% are neutral, 21% disagree, and 7% strongly disagree.

While many faculty members feel they are expected/encouraged and have ample opportunity/choice to contribute to the ESL profession by developing innovative, creative, and effective curricula and materials while meeting the final objectives of the course, a minority feel that it is not always feasible because of time, syllabus, and curriculum

constraints. The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed, 35% strongly agree, 35% agree, 14% are neutral, and 14% disagree.

Faculty members agree that they have been given the opportunity and choice to participate in professional development that introduces/enhances instructional materials and methodologies. However, they would like to see a wider variety in the workshops/topics offered that would better suit their interests, experiences, and needs as they have no choice/input in what is being selected. The research shows that out of 15 faculty members surveyed, 23% strongly agree, 38% agree, 23% are neutral, 7% disagree and 7% strongly disagree.

During the self-study it was determined that there was a definite need to include faculty members more in the decision making process when it comes to issues of curriculum and materials. A curriculum committee for IEP was formed and the chair of the committee is charged with augmenting more communications and articulation between other departments and IEP. The curriculum committee gives faculty members the opportunity to discuss and provide adequate feedback on issues of curriculum, materials and methodologies, so that feedback is more formal and documented.

Additionally, the IEP arranged for more additional faculty meetings prior to the commencement of a new semester in order to address, discuss and explain issues related to curriculum, materials, and methodologies. Awareness among faculty members needs to be raised as to why the curriculum, methodologies, and materials are put in place and that even though feedback is encouraged and considered, it is not always feasible to implement. Often decisions need to be made that not all faculty members can agree on, but all are expected to following in order to meet program needs.

Section D Recommendations, plan of action, timeline, persons responsible

There are no plans for any changes in this area.

Curriculum Standard 4: The program or institution has a plan, in writing, for regular curriculum review and for modification of all curricular components.

Section A Description of current operations to show how the standard is met.

Curriculum Change

Continuous curriculum change and innovation are necessary in the IEP. Curriculum is the foundation of student learning, thus, with shifting needs and demands, curriculum requires a built-in adjustment mechanism that enables holistic and effective reviews, and the flexibility to enable integration whenever necessary.

In 2005, the IEP developed a curriculum review policy and procedure (C-4-1) in order to establish concrete academic guidelines and streamline a process that would enhance efficiency of process and effectiveness of outcome. As per policy, the IEP has mandated a curriculum review every three (3) years or as deemed necessary. This policy and procedure was developed, therefore, with the understanding that multiple reviews are necessary considering the specific conditions within which the IEP operated including the start-up environment, and the fact that the IEP dovetailed undergraduate programs that required stringent matriculation criteria in regards to specific language and academic skills (see curriculum review in the IEP Annual Reports on site). As a direct consequence of the University's start-up situation in an environment where private higher education has been in existence for only six years, the IEP has been compelled to implement what were often dramatic changes to its curriculum as a response to the recognition of real (as opposed to assumed) student needs and abilities including:

- High student in-take in the first four (4) years of operations
- Student performance data
- Availability of new research regarding Arab learners of ESL
- Continuous formal as well informal input from the IEP faculty and staff, and the undergraduate faculty and staff

Thus, curriculum review and development considers nine (9) input variables:

1. Student feedback
2. Evaluation of courses
3. Needs of current student population
4. Student success rates
5. Feedback from instructors and program administration
6. Feedback from marketing/recruiting staff
7. Student enrollment patterns
8. Findings from professional development options of instructors
9. Recent trends in second language acquisition

The Process of Curriculum Review and Change

Since operations, the IEP curriculum has undergone reviews and evaluations on a semester by semester basis. Historically, the IEP faculty has met twice a semester and will continue to do so. During these meetings, the IEP faculty reviews the student reception of any changes that might have occurred from the previous semester based on formal and informal information such as in- and out-of class assessments, student reactions to selected readings and assignments, faculty perceptions as to how students are maneuvering through the material delivered in respective classes, and the effectiveness of instructional support including but not limited to textbooks and on-line instructional support. The information compiled during these meetings became the basis from which the IEP coordinators developed an action plan

for curricular amendments for the upcoming semester. (see Curriculum Standard 1 for history of curriculum reviews)

In summary, the IEP has an ongoing process for curriculum review and revision which formally involves the IEP faculty and takes into account the stated academic expectations and assessments of student performance. The curriculum is the formal plan designed by the IEP to carry out its Mission Statement, and to meet IEP's expectations for academic achievement. It draws deliberate connections between how it is intended to function to practical applications in its instructional practices utilized in the classroom or co-curricular activities. The success of the connection is contingent on the faculty's commitment to continuous review, evaluation, and revision of the curriculum leading to improved student learning (see Student Evaluation of Teaching C-4-2).

The existence of an IEP Curriculum Committee in the last four years of operations would have merely impeded the process of curriculum development for the following reason:

The start-up environment within which the IEP operated required that the IEP respond to student needs immediately and effectively. In committee structures, decision-making processes typically require time. Under the constraints of start-up, where catering to student needs requires often radical curricular adjustment, committee bureaucracy often impedes the required response time. Developing a curriculum from unavailable national data or educational data is at best challenging. The language competencies of students were of paramount importance to the University, and thus curriculum development was a continuous process that required almost constant and immediate attention. With the newly found stability, curriculum development at this point is systematized through a curriculum committee.

Therefore, the curriculum review charge was the responsibility of the coordinators with the support and assistance of all IEP personnel, including the Director, senior instructors and instructors. Faculty members within the program are encouraged to participate in the on-going evaluation and re-evaluation of all assignments, materials, outcomes, and objectives. The development of a curriculum proposal considers the following (Appendix A, pp. 86-87):

What is the current situation?

1. How is the instructor performing, and what could be improved in terms of
    - cohesiveness of program
    - recruitment and retention of students
    - efficiency of teaching/learning process
    - communication, collaboration among course instructors
    - student learning outcomes
    - the learning environment
    - assessment procedures
    - responding to diversity among students
    - use of learning resources
    - methods and methodology
2. Look at data, collect some data
3. Reflect on experiences

What are the alternatives?

1. Open up to new ideas, explore possibilities for innovations
    - self-directed learning
    - cooperative learning/teamwork
    - problem-based learning

- education for critical thinking
- resource-based learning
- interdisciplinary study
- outcomes-based education
- experiential learning

2. Attend workshops, engage in extensive professional research, exchange of ideas
   - participate in professional development
   - develop appropriate workshops relevant to departmental needs

When coordinators have identified a clear rationale for curriculum change, developed possible alternatives and procedures of implementation, and solicited a majority of faculty "buy-in" for the changes, the Director approves the implementation of curriculum change. The Director must measure the consequences of the change on other aspects of the learning system.

For example, at the beginning of IEP, the curriculum was reviewed by instructors at least once a semester. Typically, coordinators would lead these reviews. Suggestions would be proposed to the instructors at an end of semester meeting to give the curricular review some structure and serve as a catalyst for discussion. These propositions concerned textbooks, assignments and learning outcomes, and were based on observations voiced by IEP instructors, student achievement results and observations on former IEP students' performance in UG classes as voiced by UG faculty. Instructors were invited to share their concerns, propose their suggestions and give their opinion on curricular propositions. In one instance, all IEP instructors were asked to report on the course they had taught for the Fall 2006 semester and submit learning outcome suggestions for curriculum revisions (see curriculum minutes C-4-3). For example, in Spring 2006 instructors were asked to review a selection of textbooks and write their justification for accepting or rejecting a textbook (see textbook review minutes C-4-4). In addition, the instructors could suggest other textbooks which had not been previously recommended.

IEP instructors have always been encouraged to pilot new material and seek improvements to the curriculum through curricular review meetings and based on their own initiative. Often, when instructors felt that students' needs were not being met by the curriculum, action was taken immediately. With the approval and guidance from the Director and coordinators, instructors could implement changes to the curriculum. In other cases, issues which had been brought up in curricular review meetings might not have been resolved satisfactorily, and were tabled for further discussion until a later date when viable solutions were developed. A specific example of the above occurred with the IEP's Oral Communications regarding presentations: During curricular review meetings, it had been brought to attention that improvements in standardizing formal presentations were needed. However, no feasible action plan was implemented. In the summer of 2007, a member of the curriculum team charged with developing the Oral Communication's component was charged with researching public speaking textbooks and material to design a more standardized set of formal presentations throughout all three IEP levels. Previous IEP presentation material and student performance were used to support and justify decisions. Types of presentations were considered for different IEP levels based on the students' language ability and skills and, ultimately, for undergraduate graduate studies and beyond. Student learning outcomes with band descriptors (see M:Drive\IENG\Oral Communications, Presentations and Toast Masters' Oral Communications Band Descriptors) were written for both instructors and students to ensure that fair grading was put into practice and all stakeholders were informed. The standardization not only included types of presentation with learning outcomes, but also

marking sheets, work sheets, and example presentations (see example on site in the M:Drive). It should be noted that other faculty members were involved in helping develop standardized worksheets. A rationale and justification (see M:Drive) were also developed by key faculty and submitted to the Director and coordinators for approval.

In Fall 2008, the Oral Communication instructors and Reading and Writing instructors began to meet with their respective coordinators twice a month to review the curriculum. The goals for these meetings are to systematize and formalize the review of curriculum, syllabus, classes, and assignments; and to further encourage the standardization of grading and coursework.

As an integral part of the IEP hiring process, the director of IEP makes a deliberate attempt to diversify the various ESL/EFL backgrounds and research interests of prospective faculty relative to ESL/EFL research and development in order to assure that curriculum is solidly informed by active research in regards to the newest teaching methodologies, student assessment techniques, curriculum development strategies and implementation.

Research: Language Acquisition and Language Teaching

The IEP at AUK makes, and has from its inception made, every effort to engage with and make extensive use of research into language acquisition, composition, reading, listening, speaking, assessment, and teaching methodologies in an attempt to actualize the Mission Statements of both the University and the program and the outcomes of each level of instruction while recalling at all times that writing in all the above-named areas constitutes theory and not unassailable facts or truths. Curricular decisions in the IEP also keep ever-present in mind the nature of AUK students: their cultural background, their educational experience, and their psychological makeup. If the IEP can be said to embrace one over-arching theoretical line of thinking, it is Diane Larsen-Freeman's "Principled Eclecticism" (2000) which "encourages instructors to consider carefully the different trends and ideas that have occurred historically, and to choose those that most closely fit the needs of a particular classroom or individual student" (Maggie Sokolik, "Writing," Practical English Language Teaching, David Nunan, ed., McGraw Hill Contemporary, New York, 2003, p. 91).

The decision to move a portfolio system of evaluating reading and writing in the IEP demonstrates "Principled Eclecticism" in action in AUK's IEP. The portfolio system as articulated by Peter Elbow and Pat Belanoff ("Portfolios as a Substitute for Proficiency Examinations," College Composition and Communication, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Oct, 1986), 336-339, JSTOR, 31 Oct 2005, http://www.jstor.org) comprises two norming sessions, one at midterm, the other at the close of term. Their midterm norming session involves teachers presenting drafts of student work to other teachers who vote on whether a student's work is passing or not; this is the only feedback given by outside readers at this time. Teachers who disagree with a reader's evaluation can request a second reader. At end of term, students submit a 4-piece portfolio containing an expressive "personal piece," an essay on some academic topic, an analysis-of-text piece, and a one-draft-only in-class essay. The end-of-term norming session requires that each portfolio be evaluated by two readers. While most evaluations are considered the final word on a student's passing or failing that particular course, there is a chance for additional revision if the failure has resulted from the poor quality of only one piece of writing (see entire research Appendix A. pp. 87-89).

Section B 1) documents in the report

IEP Curriculum Review Policy and Procedure (Operations Manual Appendix I Curriculum Review Policy, pp. 504-505)	C-4-1
Student Survey sample with results (Banner Self Service)	C-4-2

Operations Manual III. Curriculum Guidelines, Curriculum Planning pp. 86-87	Appendix A
Minutes of Curriculum Meeting (M:Drive/Administration/Meeting/ IEP Meeting)	C-4-3
Minutes of Textbook Selection (M:Drive/Administration/Meeting/ IEP Meeting)	C-4-4
Operations Manual III Curriculum Guidelines, Research pp. 87-89	Appendix A

a. documents on site

Example Presentations IENG 010/020/030	M:Drive/Courses/IENG/ (section)
Example of marking sheets, work sheets, and example presentations	M:Drive:/Courses/IENG/ Oral Communications, Presentations and Toast Masters'
Curriculum 2004-2005	Director's Office
IEP Annual Reports of Curriculum review and changes	Director's Office
Interview with coordinators	

Section C Performance self-appraisal

As stated in Curriculum Standard 1, at the onset of the self-study, the development of a curriculum matrix underscored the need for revision in the Reading and Writing course at all three levels. The curriculum matrix confirmed the strength of the Oral Communications curriculum as being sufficiently linear and as abiding by a smooth progression of language production. However, the curriculum matrix also revealed that the discreet skills in the Reading and Writing process were not adequately distributed among the three levels. Through the application of a measurement tool, the curriculum matrix, the recent curriculum review was effective in locating redundancies and loop-holes.

The faculty and staff involvement during the most recent review procedure was satisfactory. For example, in the ENGL 031/099 curriculum, the faculty teaching Reading and Writing were charged with researching various Bridge Programs and Portfolio assessment systems at leading institutions in the United States with remedial English classes and/or ESL programs. Based on the research, faculty were able to discern the latest technology and methodology for instructional strategies, and came to the conclusion that basic academic cognitive learning was the optimal approach for ENGL 031/099.

As stated above, the start-up environment within which the IEP operated required that the IEP respond to student needs immediately and effectively. The frequency of curriculum review and/or design to cater to student needs often required radical curricular adjustment. The IEP faculty and staff are cognizant of the nature of our particular realities to curriculum review, evaluation and readjustment. Historically, during the faculty interview process, the Director emphasizes the demand on faculty regarding curricular changes and the need for genuine team involvement, continuous monitoring of student learning outcomes, and flexibility. Radical curriculum adjustments are challenging for instructors in that they require energy and time. Institutional longevity and history, however, contributes to curricular stability which is what the IEP attainted through a Curriculum Committee that became functional in Fall 2008.

As mentioned in Curriculum Standard 3, the decision for a Curriculum Committee was based on a survey conducted during the self-study. The committee is responsible for reviewing the curriculum, developing plans with timelines, tasks, processes, and a charge for revisions of

the curriculum. The committee acts as a stabilizing factor that enables the streamlining of procedures and the more effective and efficient designation of tasks.

Section D Recommendations, plan of action, timeline, persons responsible

There are no plans for any changes in this area.