Coordinated English language programs: Three views

Heidi Evans
Ritsumeikan University, College of Information Science and Engineering
Amy Fenning
Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies
Juanita Heigham
Sugiyama Jogakuen University, Department of Foreign Studies

Many English language programs within Japanese universities are moving toward increased program coordination where all teachers follow common lesson plans and use the same or similar materials and assessment procedures to reach shared goals. Such coordinated programs can build community, identity, and motivation among teachers as well as promote consistency in teaching and grading. This can ultimately ensure that all students receive roughly equal learning opportunities. In this article, three different coordinated programs are introduced. The typical challenges found in this type of program will be highlighted.

　日本の大学における英語のプログラムの多くは、共有された目標に到達するために、全ての教師が共通の教科プランに従い、全く同じか似通った教材と評価手順を用いるプログラムの組み合わせの増加の方向に移りつつある。こうした組み合わされたプログラムは指導およびグレーディングにおける内容を向上させるとともに、教師の間のコミュニティー、アイデンティティ、モチベーションを創造しうる。このことは究極的には全ての学生がだいたいにおいて等しい学ぶ機会を享受することを確約しうる。この論文では、3つの異なる組み合わされたプログラムが紹介されている。このタイプのプログラムにおいて見出された典型的な難問が強調されるであろう。

In recent years, a number of Japanese universities have either created new, coordinated English language programs or have increased coordination in existing ones, while others have been considering implementing them (Anderson et al, 2000; Mori & Ito, 2001; Prichard, 2006). This article provides a brief introduction to three models of coordinated programs in Japan and illustrates how coordination is applied in different contexts. We define a *coordinated program* as a program where teachers teach from common syllabi using the same, or similar, lesson plans, materials, and assessment instruments to reach shared goals and objectives. Coordinated programs typically exhibit these features: departmental support, streamed students, horizontally and vertically integrated curriculum, and collaboration among all teachers for ongoing curriculum revision and innovation.

Each of the three contexts will be introduced, along with a short explanation of student life within the programs. The organizational structure and the coordination among the participating teachers will then be addressed. Next, challenges and future outlooks will be discussed, and finally, we will conclude with some general considerations of the benefits and limitations of coordinated programs.

Three models

Sugiyama Jogakuen University, Department of Foreign Studies
Nagoya, Aichi

Program overview

The Sugiyama Jogakuen University Communicative English Program (CEP) began in 2001 as a replacement for the antiquated Freshman English Program, the main developmental English component for the Department of Foreign Studies. The department faculty wanted to abandon this old program to improve the developmental English opportunities offered to the students. There were hopes that students' English abilities would show greater improvement within a new program, and this improvement would attract students of higher academic achievement to the department. The new CEP includes courses for three years, and its focus can loosely be described as English for General Purposes, with a slight emphasis on academic skills. All courses are integrated both horizontally and vertically, and most of the materials used for them are produced collaboratively in house, although a few courses use published texts. In designing the CEP, every attempt was made to create a program that focuses on communication, both spoken and written, but also provides the foundation and structure students need in order to build competence in these areas. See Appendix A for an overview of the curriculum.

Student life

The CEP is small, serving around 340 students in classes of 18-22. Most participants are English majors, but about 12 percent are non-majors who elect to participate in the program, so overall motivation is fairly high. At the start of students' first year, they are streamed within their group, majors or non-majors, by results on the department-administered TOEIC Bridge. Streaming continues throughout the program but with the TOEIC IP.

The CEP is competitive and begins with six groups of freshman, then decreases to three groups of sophomores and finally to two groups of juniors. Students are promoted based on a combination of year-end teacher recommendations and TOEIC IP scores.

The program aims to foster learner autonomy, and one way it does this is by providing students with a variety of opportunities for them to use English outside the classroom. These opportunities include:

1. Access to our Self-Access Center.

2. The English Festival. An event where students write and perform their own plays in English for other students.

3. English Chitchat. Conversation groups hosted by third and fourth-year students offered five times a week.

4. English Journal. A competitive journal to which students may submit original writing.

5. Study Abroad Programs.

Teachers

The CEP is a part of the Department of Foreign Studies, but it is granted significant autonomy; decisions are left more or less to the teachers participating in it. The program is organized by a director who is on a five-year non-renewable contract (although the current director was retained for an additional five years). Three full-time teachers on three-year non-renewable contracts co-manage with her, and 13 part-time teachers, who teach up to eight 90-minute classes a week, make up the rest of the team. There are high expectations of all the teachers in the program, most notably the part-time teachers. Full-time teachers at the university level are routinely asked to participate in curriculum planning and materials design in a coordinated program, but part-time teachers are not usually given such responsibility. When coordination exists, it generally happens from the top down. However, in the CEP, all teachers are invited, and expected, to contribute to the ever-evolving curriculum and coordination of the program. This involvement at all levels helps to keep the curriculum fresh and the program dynamic.

Coordination

As mentioned above, all the teachers teaching in the program participate in course and materials development. Additionally, many teachers are given multiple classes and are asked to teach more than one course within the program. This enables them to know what is going on in other classes so they are able to easily make links among different classes. The participation in course development and the opportunity to teach multiple classes help ensure that teachers feel both a high level of course ownership and loyalty to the program. These things foster coordination.

Teachers are also encouraged to send messages to their students, such as reminding them about an upcoming test or complementing or reprimanding them for some event, via other teachers. This allows the teachers to keep abreast of things going on in their students' other classes, and allows the students to see that their teachers are working together and that they are all part of a program, not just a group of classes on the same subject. Furthermore, teachers encourage students to join in the out-of-class opportunities mentioned above, and this reinforces the feeling of program unity among the students as they participate in activities with students within the program but not in their classes.

Assessment for the courses is also a collaborative venture among teachers. After finalizing the curriculum, all the teachers teaching a given course set up the grading criterion and percentage divisions. Once these decisions have been agreed upon, the syllabus is made. Additionally, all quizzes and tests are made collaboratively by the teachers giving them. The end result is that within a given course, year, or the program as a whole, there is a strong degree of standardization, and it can be hoped that students are receiving roughly the same education.

Challenges

The day-to-day challenges related to the structure of the CEP are comparatively few. There are numerous other challenges, like balancing entertainment value with educational merit while trying to please the ever more demanding student *customers*. However, in relation to the coordinated aspects of the program, there is a surprisingly high degree of contentment. Because of the relatively small size of Sugiyama's CEP, the coordination and high level of participation by all teachers in it is relatively easy to maintain. The formation of successful task groups or teams that are given the power to make choices in their work together would likely be more difficult if the program were appreciably larger. Nevertheless, success in a larger context would not be impossible to achieve.

The long-term challenge for the program is the problem of terminal contracts. The program is forced into mild if not dire upheavals every three years. Not a single cohort of students can complete the program without experiencing a significant change in the teachers, and approaches, they face in the classroom. Although there has been some attempt to maintain a degree of continuity by having the director stay for five years instead of three, the constant changes in the program weaken it, and in turn decrease the level of positive impact it can have on the students who take part in it.

Future outlook

Looking toward the future, a number of changes appear on the horizon. First, currently the English majors and non-majors share the same curriculum within the CEP. For the majors, the rigorous program is appropriately challenging; however, for some of the non-majors, it is too difficult. Discussions are now in progress about the possibility of having two separate curricula with each targeted at the students it serves.

Another upcoming change is that three new full-time teachers will be joining the program in the next academic year. With them will come many new ideas that will no

doubt invigorate the program, but at the same time, there will be a deep disruption to the existing culture when they join the team. These new people will bring different teaching approaches, work ethics, personalities, and expectations with them, and all those things, and more, will have to be neatly woven into the program if the change is to be a good one.

Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies
Sanda, Hyogo

Program overview

The English Language Program (ELP) at Kwansei Gakuin University's School of Policy Studies (SPS) started when the Policy Studies department was created in1995. The SPS-ELP is a highly rigorous English language program founded on progressive pedagogical and learning principles and with high standards, and students often choose SPS because of the ELP. The ELP is a content-based, integrated-skills English for Academic Purposes program. It is highly coordinated and uses no published textbooks. All teachers and students participating in a particular course follow a common syllabus and use the same materials. Materials are made in house by full-time Associate Lecturers of English (ALEs).

All ELP students complete four courses each semester for four semesters (see chart in Appendix B). ELP courses are a core requirement for the first two years, but students may elect to continue into third-year English courses and upper division content courses which are conducted in English. The program provides students with skills transferable beyond their academic experiences and into their future careers.

Student life

Nearly 900 students are enrolled in the ELP, with approximately 450 per entering class. Students are streamed according to the ITP TOEFL into relatively small groups. Class sizes vary by skill area, with 28-32 students in listening, reading, and presentation classes and 23-28 in writing classes and *seminar* (speaking skills) classes. This relatively small size makes for an atmosphere that promotes accountability because students must interact during the class, and thus there are very few behavioral problems. A strict grading policy is in place: students must earn an average of 60% for all four English classes in order to advance to the next semester. If their cumulative scores for all four classes total less than 60%, they must wait out a full year and repeat that level.

Teachers

Several School of Policy Studies tenured teachers form the ELEC (English Language Education Committee) which oversees the program; however, the eight ALEs handle the scheduling, hiring of both full- and part-time staff, and all administrative duties, with the two most senior members co-coordinating. Each ALE is responsible for writing materials for and managing one class each semester. ALEs have 5 to 15 teachers – both full- and part-time – teaching the courses they coordinate. The program employs 20 regular part-time teachers, each teaching 1 or 2 days a week, three classes per day. Part-time teachers may not teach more than two days, but there are no contract limits for them.

The ALEs share one office and the part-timers use the Materials Development Room (MDR) next door, where there are copy machines, computers and printers, a large conference table, and bookshelves with resources. This close proximity makes for a friendly and collegial atmosphere that promotes collaboration. ALEs can often be found in the MDR throughout the day, and the ALEs coordinating the courses on a particular day are certain to be there, ensuring that their courses are running smoothly and that all teachers have the required materials and understand the lesson plans.

Coordination

As mentioned above, materials are developed in-house. Incoming ALEs inherit a course to coordinate. Based on teacher feedback throughout the semester and at closing meetings, the course/lesson plans may require changes, minor or major. Major course changes must adhere to course goals and objectives and require consensus amongst the ALE team. ALEs work on materials during the spring and summer breaks as well as during the semester. Assessment for any particular course is decided by the ALE in charge of the course and laid out on an Excel spreadsheet which is sent to all teachers on the course for the inputting of grades throughout the semester. There is a recent effort to standardize rubrics and grading scales across all courses and levels. Since teachers need some room to display their individual teaching styles (Prichard, 2006), in 2004 ALEs undertook the task of writing goals and objectives for each of the 14 core courses in order to allow greater flexibility for experienced teachers to use their own materials provided they stayed consistent to a course's goals and objectives.

This allows for the generation of new materials that can later be incorporated into course curricula.

Challenges

There are many challenges for the program. First, with regard to the students, the 2006 incoming SPS class increased from around 450 to 560 due to a larger-than-usual enrollment. Whether this is an exception or trend remains to be seen. Although several temporary part-time positions were created to accommodate this rise, there is concern that the increase has affected the quality of education, and in the future may add to the workload of the staff. Moreover, the ability range amongst students is greater, and there is an increasing number of special needs students, both physically-impaired students who require extra attention and socially withdrawn students who find it difficult to handle the interaction required in our English classes. These students have required tutoring and additional care.

Next, contract issues impede materials development and create tensions between part-time teachers and ALEs. The ALE limited contract system takes its toll on materials development, as it is difficult to get courses to a *complete* point when a new ALE with different approaches rotates into a course's coordination. As a result, materials are continually undergoing revisions and some part-time teachers feel that ALEs do not spend adequate time on them. In addition, since part-time teachers are not restricted by a limited contract but ALEs are limited to four years, the part-time staff, many who have been employed since the program's inception, often have more knowledge of the program and feel more long-term investment in it. Also, it can be difficult to determine

whether or not part-time teachers are adhering to the goals and objectives of a course or even using the materials/assessment set forth by the course coordinator.

Finally, lack of consistent management is also an ongoing challenge. One-year co-coordination involves two ALEs working together to oversee the program, with one ALE serving as the *senior* co-coordinator and the other ALE as the *junior* co-coordinator; this duty rotates with one ALE beginning service in the spring and a second ALE taking over in the fall. In this way, the more experienced co-coordinator always overlaps with the newer co-coordinator. But as soon their year of management service is completed, they leave the university and another ALE rotates in. There are manuals to guide co-coordinators, but many important administrative decisions are not passed down appropriately, and the same problems often repeat themselves every few years. Furthermore, it can be difficult for teachers without management experience to supervise colleagues.

Future outlook

Although there are challenges for the program, great care has been given to building collaboration by supporting channels of communication amongst staff and the creation of a fair, transparent system of materials development and course coordination. Currently, several changes are being discussed. One is the replacement of in-house materials with published textbooks in several of the classes. Another is that an academic and non-academic track system is being considered to accommodate students with different goals. Additionally, in 2007, the ELP will experiment with a single-coordinator system to streamline all administrative decisions, though a tenured, non-contract on-staff manager is not being considered and is much needed.

Ritsumeikan University, College of Information Science and Engineering
Kusatsu, Shiga

Program overview

In 2004 Ritsumeikan University opened the College of Information Science and Engineering (CISE) at its Biwako Campus. The program aims to increase students' English language proficiency and deepen their knowledge of Information Technology (IT) to prepare them for engineering and computer-related careers. The new department further allows Ritsumeikan University to compete with other similar Kansai-based programs. For science students, the program is demanding. In addition to their core major classes, all CISE students complete two years of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses. These content-based, integrated-skills courses are horizontally and vertically integrated, and utilize published IT-specific texts and in-house materials.

The CISE English Language Program (ELP) serves students from five majors, and as such, must incorporate IT-specific content yet be accessible for students with different career goals (students major in Computer Science, Information and Communication Science, Media Technology, Human and Computer Intelligence, or Bioscience and Bioinformatics). First-year students take three English courses per semester and second-year students take two per semester. In these courses students complete IT-textbook activities along with individual and collaborative

project work, essay-writing, discussions, and presentations. The chart in the Appendix C outlines the curriculum.

Student life

The ELP is comprised of nearly 1500 students, roughly 750 per cohort. Classes average 38 students and nearly 90% are male. Entering students are streamed with an in-house placement test modeled after the TOEIC IP into pre-intermediate, intermediate, and upper-intermediate levels. Students are then re-streamed in the second year using another version of the placement test, administered at the end of the first academic year. Since students enroll in the CISE to prepare for IT-related careers, they are generally less interested in English than students from other humanities and social sciences departments.

Teachers

The CISE employs tenured, full-time contract and part-time staff. The program is organized and run by three tenured staff who also teach six classes each. The tenured staff created the initial ELP curriculum and continue to oversee its implementation. They are also responsible for all hiring decisions, scheduling, and the general day-to-day running of the program. The full-time contract teachers are subdivided into *jokin*, henceforth, 'senior lecturer' and *shokutaku* or 'junior lecturer.' The three senior lecturers teach nine classes and develop the curriculum and materials, and the five junior lecturers teach ten classes and have the option to contribute to program development. Seven part-time teachers teach one to ten classes per semester. The tenured staff offices and part-time teachers' room are located in the department's main building, far apart, on different floors. Senior and junior lecturers' offices are in the same building, but on opposite sides of that building from each other, making it difficult to meet and exchange ideas.

Coordination

Tenured and senior lecturers now coordinate the curriculum which continues to be modified. Using student and teacher feedback, the senior lecturers revise the intermediate and upper-intermediate curriculum and the tenured staff focus on the pre-intermediate curriculum, which is largely taught by tenured or Japanese-native speaker teachers. Senior lecturers coordinate two to three courses each, meaning they create the syllabi, assessment instruments, project-work materials, and textbook supplements, and ensure all teachers on the course understand how to implement the curriculum. The senior lecturers develop materials collaboratively, and this promotes consistency across course materials in terms of formatting, metalanguage, and content. Further, common assessment instruments were created to facilitate consistency and fairness in grading and make assessment transparent for students and teachers. The tenured staff do the same with pre-intermediate courses.

To encourage staff involvement and build accountability, channels for communication have been created. Teachers attend meetings, use email, and utilize the online computer system (described below). First, teachers are required to attend pre-semester meetings where they receive course documents and post-semester meetings where they have the opportunity to give feedback on the course. They also

complete anonymous post-semester course evaluations for the courses they taught. Next, because most part-time teachers come to school only one day a week, all teachers are encouraged to use email to update their 'buddy teacher' (the teacher who teaches the same student group for a different course) about their students each week. Finally, tenured staff and senior lecturers occasionally offer optional faculty development meetings.

The CISE Online System is a program management and communication tool for students and teachers. The system is a password protected website which contains a program overview, course information, a grade database, and electronic communication (email, bulletin board systems) links. Teachers use the system to access course documents (materials, lesson guides) uploaded by tenured and contract teaching staff, and since many teachers teach several different courses, this system streamlines course management. Teachers also enter student grades into the customized grading database each week, which stores weekly grades and calculates total scores. Students use the system to view course syllabi, access electronic communication links, submit writing homework, and view their scores. This system benefits students by providing independent learning opportunities and encouraging them to keep track of their progress. For the administration, the system facilitates communication and delivers program information among busy teachers spread across the campus.

Challenges

As an emerging program, the CISE ELP faces two main challenges: curriculum and staffing. From a curriculum perspective, an ESP approach to program design does not match current student proficiency and needs. For first-year students especially, dealing with a new, technical vocabulary while trying to understand abstract concepts is nearly impossible, since they lack a basic grasp of the English language. Not only are the textbooks too difficult for most students, they are also out-of-date and cannot adequately prepare students for their IT careers. For some students, the textbooks are too easy, yet there are few alternatives on the market. It has become clear that a one-size-fits-all approach using outdated materials contributes to a loss in student motivation to learn English.

Staffing changes and large class sizes further make teaching and learning a challenge. In 2008, the senior lecturer contracts will expire, and their classes will be taken up by part-time teachers. In addition, since junior lecturer contracts do not stipulate curriculum development, the burden of curriculum and materials design will rest entirely on the tenured faculty. Although students have also expressed their desire for smaller classes, the average class size has grown from 34 in 2004 to 38 and will continue to increase. As classes grow larger and fewer full-time teachers are available for curriculum development, curriculum renewal will become even more difficult to implement. Finally, because different staff (tenured, senior and junior lecturers, and part-time) are housed in offices remote from each other, face-to-face communication among teachers usually only occurs at meetings twice a year and between classes, and does not encourage the kind of interaction that results when teachers share a common space. Although the online system provides avenues of communication and

distributes information, it is not a replacement for face-to-face communication which is critical in understanding what is working and what is not working within a program.

Future outlook

The ELP is revising its existing program evaluation to identify the program's strengths and weakness. The aims are to more effectively measure current and former ELP student satisfaction and attitudes and collect feedback from current teachers. To do this, the ELP is constructing CISE-specific evaluation forms to supplement the university-wide evaluations which do not consider the department's particular needs. After data is collected, the full-time faculty will be better equipped to effect curriculum change. The staff is further considering how English for General Purposes may more appropriately meet first-year students' needs by providing them with basic English skills before tackling content in the second year.

Final thoughts

Coordinated programs can benefit students, teachers, and administrators alike. Within them, students receive roughly equal learning opportunities and experiences as teachers follow a shared curriculum. Students can also benefit from the knowledge, experience, and creativity of all the teachers who are working in the program, not just the one they meet in the classroom, since all teachers participate in curriculum development. In the three programs described here, participating students have responded positively within the classroom to the fact that they know all students are working toward the same goals and are expected to meet the same standards. This has led them to feel that they are among a community of learners, and they have reported they appreciate the feeling of connectedness.

As for teachers, working in coordinated programs is especially helpful for teachers new to the profession because these programs often create a nurturing community which can provide them with direction and support. Since teachers do need some room to display their individual teaching styles (Pritchard, 2006), the programs can also be excellent places for more experienced teachers to share their knowledge and to contribute to something larger than their own course. Teachers in the above contexts have consistently reported that once they became accustomed to the sharing culture of coordinated programs, their enthusiasm and motivation for their work increased through the exchange of ideas and the opportunities—and encouragement—to try new techniques and approaches. Additionally, they have been pleased to discover that working in a coordinated program can reduce their workload, since the preparation burden is divided among all teachers.

For administrators, a coordinated curriculum promotes consistency in teaching and grading across sections and this builds professional accountability into the program. Coordination also creates opportunities for program evaluation which can lead to positive curriculum renewal. Eliciting feedback from teachers and students is critical to the success of any program, especially a coordinated one (Sharp, 1990; Lynch, 1996), and when an assessment scheme is consistent throughout, managers can track the program's effectiveness and identify what is working and what needs to be improved. This system of ongoing refinement can yield rich opportunities which cycle back to reward all those who are, and will be, participating in the program.

However, coordinated programs are not without their challenges. They require time, dedication, and consistency from the administration and all teachers in order to evolve with the ever-changing needs of the students they serve. From the students' point of view, it is critical that coordination be carried out consistently by their classroom teachers. If teachers interpret and implement program guidelines and course objectives differently (e.g., policy on lateness or homework feedback), students will notice the disparity and complain about it on course evaluations. For this reason, ongoing communication is imperative to ensure all teachers are on board with program philosophy to ensure students are treated fairly and equally. Coordination works best when clear communication channels are created, collaboration is encouraged, and teacher autonomy is preserved. Administrators must recognize the importance of these features and make a concentrated effort to maintain communication among all stakeholders by creating physical and virtual spaces for sharing ideas, ensuring ideas are heard, and allowing teachers some creative freedom in the classroom.

It is an ongoing, but rewarding, challenge to deliver consistent English education, while catering to student needs and accommodating teacher individuality. Among the challenges listed in these three models, terminal contracts were at the fore. If universities want to implement coordinated programs, they need to create lasting teaching positions, positions that begin with the programs' initial development and continue to accommodate their ongoing maintenance. Without this foundation, many of the benefits of coordinated programs mentioned above will be lost.

Heidi Evans has been working in coordinated programs in Japan since 2000 and currently teaches at Ritsumeikan University in Kusatsu. Her research interests include teacher development, curriculum and materials design, and alternative forms of evaluation.

Amy Fenning currently teaches at Kwansei Gakuin University in Sanda, Japan. Her professional interests include teacher training, academic writing, and the teaching of culture. She has taught at universities in Germany, Turkey and the U.S.

Juanita Heigham is the director of the Communicative English Program at Sugiyama Jogakuen University in Nagoya, Japan. Her research interests include learner independence, curriculum design, and teacher training.

JALT2006 — Community, Identity, Motivation

References

Anderson, G., Bodner, D., Rambo, E., Reidel, J., & Savage, L. (2000). The Coordinated English Language Program at the School of Policy Studies. *Journal of Policy Studies, 9* (1), 29-63.

Mori, C., & Ito, K. (2001). Impact of the new CEP Program: A qualitative analysis. *Heian Jogakuen University Kiyo, 3*, 65-74.

Lynch, B. (1996). *Language program evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pritchard, C. (2006). Determining the balance between teacher autonomy and curriculum coordination. *The Language Teacher, 30*(6), 9-14.

Richards, J. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sharp, A. (1990). Staff/student participation in course evaluation: a procedure for improving course design. *ELT Journal, 44* (2), 132-137.

Appendix A: Sugiyama Jogakuen University, Department of Foreign Studies

CEP First Year

1st Semester	Communicative Grammar *Development of spoken and written grammar, includes organized independent grammar-study & in-class activities, quizzes & tests*	Reading and Writing 1 *Development of reading comprehension and reading speed; paragraph writing*	Learner Training *Development of skills and strategies for learning independently*	Project-Based Speaking 1 *Development of speaking skills through project work focused on topics linked to daily communication*	Self-Access 1 *Development of English abilities through work in SAC*
2nd	"	"	Drama *Development of acting techniques — culminates in a drama festival at the end of term*	"	"

Second Year

1st & 2nd	Reading and Writing 2 *Continued development of reading comprehension and reading speed; paragraph → essay writing*	Project-Based Speaking 2 *Development of speaking skills through project work focused on topics such as developing individuality, education and social issues*	Self-Access 2 *Continued development of English abilities through work in SAC*

Third Year

1st	Reading and Writing 3 *Continued development of reading comprehension and reading speed; essay → research paper writing*	Debate *Development of formal and informal debating concepts and principles*
2nd	"	Independent Projects *Development of English abilities through independent projects where students conceive, construct and carry out individual learning plans*

Appendix B: Kwansei Gakuin University, School of Policy Studies

EC4 Writing	EC4/EC5 Special Topics		EC4 Seminar
Problem-solution research paper	*electives/topic choices*		*Issues discussions*
Social policy topics Internet/library research Increased source req't. Portfolio assessment	Content-based courses Discussions and presentations Extensive reading / Film viewing Collaborative projects		Social policy topics Discussion management Internet research with critical evaluation
EC3 Writing	**EC3 Listening**	**EC3 Presentation**	**EC3 Seminar**
Opinion paper with sources	*Films and documentaries*	*Panel discussion*	*Issues discussions*
Social policy topics (Education) Integrating outside sources Paraphrasing Citing & referencing	Social policy topics Visual/aural cues Information exchange discussions Interaction listening	Social policy topics Large group project Evaluation groups Project management	Social policy topics Discussion management Internet Research & discussions
EC2 Writing	**EC2 Listening**	**EC2 Presentation**	**EC2 Seminar**
Opinion essay & summary	*News stories*	*Skills based presentations*	*Reading based discussions*
Experiential/opinion topics Essay structure Thesis development Compare/Contrast with opinion Writing about statistics	Environmental/social topics Listening strategies Note-taking skills Transactional listening	Speaking confidence Delivery skills Audio-visual aids Audience involvement Present survey results	Personal/social topics Survey project/discussion communication strategies Jigsaw read/discussion
EC1 Writing	**EC1 Listening**	**EC1 Reading**	**EC1 Seminar**
Academic Paragraph writing	*Academic lectures*	*Reading strategies*	*Discussion gambits*
Descriptive/opinion writing Paragraph construction and analysis Idea generation techniques Intro to process approach	Environmental/social topics Listening strategies Note-taking skills Transactional listening	Environmental/social topics Vocabulary strategies Opinion discussions Extensive reading Dictionary use	Personal/social topics Small group skills Discussion member roles Opinion speech Reporting strategies

Appendix C: Ritsumeikan University, College of Information Science and Engineering

First year

	English 1: Listening / Speaking		English 2: Reading / Writing		English 3: CALL	
1st semester	**IT Content** (Computer applications; Computer parts; Inside the computer; Buying a computer; Input & output devices)	**Project work** Classroom English Pair role play	**IT Content** (same as English 1)	**Project work** Writing skills paragraph basics	**IT Content** (same as English 1)	**Project work** PowerPoint project / presentation

	English 4: Listening / Speaking		English 5: Reading / Writing		English 6: CALL	
2nd semester	**IT Content** (Monitors; Printers; Input & output devices; Magnetic & optical drives)	**Project work** IT device presentation	**IT Content** (Same as English 4)	**Project work** Writing skills IT device composition	**IT Content** (Same as English 4)	**Project work** HTML Web page project / presentation

Second year

	English 7: Listening / Speaking		English 8: Reading / Writing			
1st semester	**IT Content** (Operating systems; Graphical user interface; Internet; Graphics & design; Multimedia)	Project work Discussion skills	**IT Content** (Same as English 7)	**Project work** Writing skills Survey report	No CALL	

	English 9: Listening / Speaking		English 10 Reading / Writing			
2nd semester	**IT Content** (Programming; Computer languages; E-communication; Internet issues; New technologies)	Project work Debate basics	**IT Content** (Same as English 9)	**Project work** Writing skills Building design	No CALL	