Plan for Review of Curriculum: 2015-2018

PHILOSOPHY: A review of curriculum may result in possible programmatic adjustments in curriculum course goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes as well as assessment and the overall program which will bring about improvement in students’ academic English language learning in the CIEP and fulfill the mission of the program.

EXPECTED OUTCOMES: Revise and update the CIEP curriculum reflecting current student needs and the norms in the field.

1 REVIEW OF PROGRAM FOCUS

1.1 REVIEW OF GOALS, OBJECTIVES, & STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Assess effectiveness and coherence of curriculum through analysis of goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes guiding course syllabi and identify curricular issues for adjustment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Revise any goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes as stated on program course syllabi based on the program’s mission statement, current research of student academic English needs, student and instructor feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Responsible</td>
<td>Program instructional staff, curriculum review committees, the Director, Academic Assessment Specialist, and Academic Support Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruments</td>
<td>Instructional staff orientation norming, level meeting minutes and checklists, curriculum review committee meeting minutes and documentation, university faculty surveys, interviews and syllabi studies, Teacher Feedback and Teacher-Class Evaluation forms (also reviewed in Plan for Review of Student Achievement and Plan for Review of Student Services). Teacher Feedback and Teacher-Class Evaluation forms here are examined for their information on the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.2 Level Review Meetings

Description: These meetings allow instructors of the program to discuss curriculum, assessment, instruction, syllabi, policies, and procedures in addition to student progress in small group meetings. A lead instructor guides the meeting with a prescribed agenda. Participants relate their comments from level meeting checklists which can examine a range of topics from student learning outcomes, standardized Midterm and Final Exams, diagnostic tests, syllabi, teaching materials, student motivation, and student progress in skill areas across levels. The instructor feedback from the forms and meeting minutes help analyze and, if necessary, revise goals, objectives, student learning outcomes, exams, syllabi and other instructional materials.

Outcome: The meetings function to collect information regarding curriculum so as to inform curricular change.

Staff Responsible: All instructional staff, Academic Assessment Specialist, Academic Support Coordinator, and the Director

Materials: Level Meeting Guideline Forms, Level Meeting Checklists, Level Meeting minutes

Frequency: Three meetings per session; before and after Midterm Exams and after Final Exams

1.1.3 Curriculum Review Committees

Description: Curriculum Review Committees consist of Academic Support Specialists and Assistants, the Academic Support Coordinator and Academic Assessment Specialist. They collaborate to review and revise curriculum in a regular cycle to meet students’ academic needs. The Director chooses committee members based on instructor interest and recommendations of Academic Support Coordinator. Committee members follow recent results of or create in-house UNI faculty surveys, interviews, and syllabi studies, review research in the applicable skill area, collect feedback from students and instructors to revise or develop goals, objectives and outcomes for the particular skill area. A committee also holds at least two general meetings each year with instructional staff to inform them of its progress, meet with
the Academic Support Coordinator and Academic Assessment Specialist for development discussion and the Director when necessary. The Committee keeps minutes of the meetings with staff and writes a research report, semester progress reports, textbook/material reviews, and other pertinent curriculum committee reports.

Outcome Regular review and revision of the curriculum allows the CIEP to be responsive to student needs as they change.

Staff Responsible Curriculum review committee members, Academic Assessment Specialist, Academic Support Coordinator, and the Director.

Materials Library resources to allow for a literature review of current research, most current university faculty surveys and syllabi studies report, Teacher Feedback Forms, level meeting minutes/checklists, student surveys, Climate Surveys’ reports, exit surveys.

Frequency Committees are rotational one year-18 months.

### 1.1.4 Teacher Feedback Form

**Description** In order to get detailed instructor feedback, all instructional staff complete the Teacher Feedback Form at the end of each semester. Questions on the form pertain to work environment, the curriculum, assessment practices and student services. The Director writes a summary of the teacher feedback which is published for all instructors.

**Staff Responsible** All program instructors and the Director, the Academic Support Coordinator, and Academic Assessment Specialist

**Materials** Teacher Feedback Form

**Frequency** End of each semester

### 1.1.5 Teacher/Class Evaluations

**Description** CIEP students complete anonymous Teacher/Class Evaluations in each class at the end of each session. Students evaluate the curriculum, the instructor, methods of instruction of the class, and whether they learned important academic English language skills. This evaluation is also used in the Plan for Review of Student Achievement and the Plan for Review of Student Services and their pertinent areas of focus. The Director writes and publishes a summary memo of the evaluations. Instructors also receive individual evaluation results.
2 REVIEW OF TEACHING MATERIALS

2.1 CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEES

Description: While revising and establishing goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes for the appropriate levels for the skill area, curriculum review committees assess current textbooks and other materials for their degree of application in the curriculum. The committees publish their review of the textbooks and materials for the instructional staff to provide their initial feedback. The committees in collaboration with the Academic Support Coordinator then select those major textbooks and materials that will be used in the courses and at each level. After instructors use of the new textbooks and materials, the committees and Academic Support Coordinator collect input from feedback forms (Teacher Feedback Forms, Level Review Meeting Minutes and Checklists), to further review the selected texts and materials for appropriateness for the curriculum, assess any future replacements and usability. The Textbook Acquisition Assistant, an Academic Support Specialist or Assistant, works together with the CIEP Office and bookstore in ordering textbooks and materials.

Outcomes: Identify textbooks and other major teaching materials for each level course in each skill area according to recently revised and developed goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes.

Staff Responsible: Curriculum Review Committees, Textbook Acquisition Assistant, Office staff, and Academic Support Coordinator

Medium: Curriculum review committees, instructor/student feedback, level review meetings

Materials Involved: Curriculum review committee meeting textbook and material reviews, initial instructor feedback, results of Teacher/Class Evaluations, Teacher Feedback Forms, Level Review Meeting Minutes and Checklists.

Frequency: Committees are rotational one year-18 months.
2.2 TEACHER FEEDBACK FORM

Description
Teacher Feedback form is completed by all instructional staff at the end of each semester excluding summer. Questions on the form pertain to work environment and general curriculum. This review is also used in the Plan for Review of Student Achievement and Plan for Review of Student Services. Here the form is used to obtain instructor feedback on textbooks and other materials used in the curriculum.

Staff Responsible
Curriculum Review Committees, Textbook Acquisition Assistant, Office staff, and Academic Support Coordinator

Materials
Teacher Feedback Form

Frequency
End of each semester

2.3 LEVEL REVIEW MEETINGS

Description
These meetings allow instructors teaching courses within similar levels (Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced) of the program to discuss curriculum, assessment, instruction, syllabi, policies, materials, and procedures in their respective skill areas and their relationship to student progress. Instructor feedback from level meeting minutes and checklists here is used to further review, revise, add or replace textbooks and other instructional materials.

Staff Responsible
All instructional staff, Academic Assessment Specialist, Academic Support Coordinator, and the Director

Materials
Level Meeting Guideline Forms, Level Meeting Checklists, Level Meeting minutes

Frequency
Three meetings per session.

3 REVIEW OF TEACHING METHODS AND METHODOLOGIES

3.1 CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEES
### Description
Curriculum review committees develop guidelines and overviews for instruction of courses in each skill area and level. These guide instructors to apply the teaching methods and methodology in class that they find best assists students in achieving goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes for each course, and thereby fulfilling the mission of the program.

### Staff Responsible
Curriculum Review Committees, and Academic Support Coordinator

### Materials
Curriculum review committee guidelines, overviews, research literature reviews, peer observation, supervisor observation documents.

### Frequency
Committees are rotational one year-18 months; annual observations

### 3.2 TEACHER/CLASS EVALUATIONS

#### Description
CIEP students complete anonymous Teacher/Class Evaluations in each class at the end of each session. Students evaluate the curriculum, the instructor, methods of instruction of the class, and whether they learned important academic English language skills. This evaluation is also used in the Plan for Review of Student Achievement and the Plan for Review of Student Services and their pertinent areas of focus. The Director writes and publishes a summary memo of the evaluations. Instructors also receive individual evaluation results.

#### Outcome
The Director writes and publishes a summary memo of the evaluations providing a basis to inform future action.

#### Staff Responsible
CIEP Office staff, students, instructors, and the Director.

#### Materials
Teacher/Class Evaluation forms, Teacher/Class Evaluation (individual) results, Teacher/Class Evaluation Memo

#### Frequency
End of each 8-week session

### 3.3 INSTRUCTIONAL OBSERVATIONS

#### Outcomes
Improve the instructional skill and methodology of the instructional staff through student, peer, and supervisor review.

#### Description
Using student feedback (see 2.1.1.), peer observations and supervisor observations, assess perception of quality of class and instruction; identify
issues with methodology used in curriculum and methods assessing effectiveness and coherence of curriculum.

**Instruments**
Teacher/Class Evaluation, Letter of Intention for Class Observation, Background Information for Observation, Suggestions for Presenting Feedback After in-Class Observation, CIEP Observation, Post Observation Follow-Up Forms.

**Staff Responsible**
Instructional staff, the Director, Academic Support Coordinator

**Medium**
Peer and supervisor observations, post observation meetings

**Frequency**
Annually for full-time staff; every session for Graduate Teaching Assistants

---

### 3.3.1 Peer Observations

**Outcome**
In formative observations and critiques of colleagues in the classroom, instructors will have the opportunity to expand their knowledge of teaching methodology thus providing opportunities for feedback, reflection and improvement of teaching. This will, in turn, assist students in achieving course outcomes thereby fulfilling the mission of the program.

**Description**
Instructional staff follow a protocol of one-to-one peer observations. Instructors schedule times to observe a colleague and be observed, take notes according to observation questions/checklist, meet one-on-one for post observation discussions, record post-observation follow up plans stating strengths to build on and areas to improve, suggest how to improve, and establish goals for the future. A post-observation follow-up plan is submitted to the Director. The content of the observations and critiques are shared only between the two individual instructor-observers.

**Staff Responsible**
All instructors including TESOL teaching assistants, the Director, Academic Support Coordinator

**Medium**
Classrooms, post-observation discussions/meetings.

**Instruments**
Letter of Intention for Class Observation, Background Information for Observation, Suggestions for Presenting Feedback After in-Class Observation, CIEP Observation, Post Observation Follow-Up Forms.

**Frequency**
Each Spring II Session.

---

### 3.3.2 Supervisor Observations
Academic Support Coordinator and the Director provide summative and formative feedback to instructors concerning their teaching methods, methodology in the classroom assisting students in achieving goals, objectives, and student learning out comes in their courses and thereby fulfilling the mission of the program. Instructors also complete self-appraisal of their teaching, contributions to the program, and personal goals.

Following the completion of instructor peer observations, the Director and Academic Support Coordinator observe all instructors in order to monitor methods of instruction and to determine whether instructors are assisting in improving students’ academic English language learning.

All instructors including TESOL teaching assistants, the Director, Academic Support Coordinator.

Classrooms, post-observation discussions/meetings.

Letter of Intention for Class Observation, Background Information for Observation, Suggestions for Presenting Feedback After in-Class Observation, CIEP Observation, Post Observation Follow-Up Forms.

Each Spring II Session; teaching assistants each semester.

3.3.3 Instructor Self-Appraisal

Self-Appraisal Questionnaire and Goal Worksheet prompt instructors to self-reflect and write about teaching in the program the past academic year. This reflection includes instructor contributions to the program, areas the instructor may desire more training and professional development, and plans for future goals. Instructors turn in the document to the Director and bring a copy for discussion at their Performance Appraisal meeting with their supervisor.

The purpose of this process is to encourage instructor self-reflection about teaching and professional development in the program. This not only contributes to setting goals for professional career satisfaction, but results in improved classroom instruction benefiting students’ achievement.

All instructors, Academic Support Coordinator, the Director.

Meetings with the Director, Academic Support Coordinator.

Self-Appraisal Questionnaire and Goal Worksheet.
### 3.3.4 Instructor Performance Appraisal

**Outcome**

Summative evaluation of accomplishments of instructional staff following mutually-agreed upon performance goals to identify a plan for improvement as well as short and long-term professional goals.

**Description**

University and CIEP policy state that all instructional staff complete the university performance appraisal which includes areas such as teaching knowledge, skills, methodology, organization, leadership, team work, professional development, and others. Instructors bring their Self-Appraisal Questionnaire and Goal Worksheet to their meeting with their direct supervisor for discussion. The supervisor uses the performance appraisal form to discuss areas where instructors are performing satisfactory and above in their teaching and areas where they might seek improvement.

**Staff Responsible**

Instructors, teaching assistants, graduate assistants, Academic Support Coordinator, the Director.

**Medium**

Meetings with the Director, Academic Support Coordinator.

**Instruments**

Self-Appraisal Questionnaire and Goal Worksheet, Graduate Assistant Performance Appraisal, and Professional and Scientific Performance Appraisal forms.

**Frequency**

Instructors, Spring II Session, teaching and graduate assistants, each semester.

---

## 4 REVIEW OF RESEARCH

### 4.1 SURVEY OF UNI FACULTY

**Outcomes**

Through an exhaustive needs analysis, the will be able to determine the language and academic skills CIEP students need as they matriculate into general education courses at the university.

**Description**

A survey of UNI faculty in various disciplines about their expectations for students entering classes and an analysis of syllabi from across university general education disciplines will help the CIEP ascertain how to prepare its students to succeed academically upon exit from the program. Research
results will help determine exit criteria, inform curricular changes so that students are well prepared for academic work.

Staff Responsible
Instructors designated by CIEP Director, Academic Support Coordinator

Medium
Collecting syllabi from university faculty across campus for analysis and interviewing faculty about their expectations for international students succeeding in their academic classes.

Materials
Data collected and analyzed from results of survey, collected syllabi, and interviews. Report on information gathered and impact on the curriculum for the CIEP to aid students in their academic English language classes in preparation for academic programs.

Frequency
Every 3 years in the fall.

4.2 REVIEW OF CURRENT RESEARCH IN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Description
Instructors and curriculum review committees conduct in-house research and produce reports on skill areas and methodology (see in English language teaching from workshops and conferences. These are published on the CIEP website and discussed in staff meetings.

Outcomes
A review of current research in second language acquisition and language instruction services to inform curriculum and assessment practices for possible curricular adjustments.

Staff Responsible
Instructional staff, curriculum review committees.

Medium
Professional conferences, professional development presentations, webinars, meetings, in-house research projects

Materials Involved
Conference memos, reports, research memo to Director per release time

Frequency
Ongoing

5 IMMERSION PROGRAMS CURRICULUM

Description
The CIEP Director and CIEP Staff work with the immersion program representatives to plan for any such upcoming special program. The Director selects the curriculum coordinator and additional instructors for the immersion program. They work in collaboration to assess the needs of
the students in each program, develop and instruct courses following the special goals, objectives, and student learning outcomes for each skill area. Immersion program students’ English proficiency is assessed and students placed in the appropriate levels. The instructors assess the students’ academic English performance in the program and compile a final pass-fail report. Students are surveyed about the curriculum as well as other components of the program (see Plan for Review of Student Achievement and the Plan for Review of Student Services).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Review how the special curriculum designed for these students helped them meet their English language learning needs and what could be revised in the curriculum for subsequent programs to improve students’ achievement of their goals.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Responsible</td>
<td>Immersion Program curriculum coordinator, instructors, the Director, and Academic Support Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Immersion Program curriculum preliminary needs survey, placement tests, course syllabi, goals, objectives, student learning outcomes, evaluations, exit survey, post-program report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Scheduled for each program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 **EXTERNAL REVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>UCIEP, AAIEP, CEA provide professional evaluation of intensive English programs so that they meet the needs of enrolled students. UCIEP and AAIEP require program self-appraisals. CEA requires a self-study, committee review, and site visit for accreditation and reaccreditation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>UCIEP, AAIEP, CEA evaluation will serve as an objective means to identify curricular issues and inform possible programmatic adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Responsible</td>
<td>CIEP Director, Academic Support Coordinator, and other designated staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Evaluations, reports, site visits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Applications, self-studies, reviews, and reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>UCIEP, AAIEP, every 5 years. CEA, 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task for Review</td>
<td>Fall 1 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Review Goals, Objectives, Student Learning Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.1 Instructional Staff Orientation Norming</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.2 Level Review Meetings</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.3 Curriculum Review Committees</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.4 Teacher Feedback Forms</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.5 Teacher/Class Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Review of Teaching Materials</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Curriculum Review Committees</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Teacher Feedback Form</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Level Review Meetings</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 Review Teaching Methods, Methodologies</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.1 Curriculum Review Committees</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 Teacher/Class Observations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 Instructional Observations</strong></td>
<td>As applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.1 Peer Observations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.2 Supervisor Observations</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.3 Instructor Self-Appraisal</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.4 Instructor Performance Appraisal (Instructors)</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3.4 Instructor Performance Appraisal (Teaching Assistants)</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 Review of Research</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Survey of UNI faculty</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Review Current Research Language Teaching, Learning</strong></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 Immersion Programs Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>As applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 External Review</strong></td>
<td>As applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 External Review UCIEP</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 External Review AAIEP</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 External Review CEA- Reaccreditation Self-Study</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>