

Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

Giancarla Unser-Schutz
Rissho University

Reference Data:

Unser-Schutz, G. (2016). Improving a university English program: Issues from one case study. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & H. Brown (Eds.), *Focus on the learner*. Tokyo: JALT.

Although Japanese universities are being pressured to become more global, many are still struggling to develop effective core English curricula. This paper describes one such faculty's attempts to improve its program. Having faced severe student dissatisfaction with English courses, the faculty reanalyzed its English needs and identified two problems: unclear curriculum guidelines and insufficient course linking. New course guidelines were written to outline the curriculum and a common textbook was adopted to offer consistency across course sections. Follow-up surveys suggested that the common textbook increased communication between students and was effective in reducing content-based differences. However, students became more conscious of differences between instructors, suggesting a greater need to address differing teaching styles head-on. Initiating changes for improvement lessened some problems but also brought up unpredicted new issues. Effective efforts for improvement must have long-term vision and be adaptable to change over time.

日本の大学の多くが、未だに英語教育の基盤的カリキュラムを発展させるのに苦労している。本論は、そのような問題に直面している本学の一学部の英語教育を強化する取り組みを概説する。英語科目に対する学生の満足度が極端に低いという実態に対し、当学部の英語教育に対するニーズを再分析した。その結果、カリキュラムのガイドラインが曖昧、また科目間のつながりが弱いという問題点が確認された。そこで、科目間の一貫性を強化すべく、新しいガイドラインが作成され、共通の教科書が指定された。学生に実施したアンケート結果によると、共通の教科書を用いたことにより学生間のコミュニケーションが増え、科目内容の一貫性に一役買ったことが示された。同時に、教員間の差がより顕著になり、指導方法による差をなくすことに積極的に取り組む必要性も示唆された。この状況を改善する取り組みには長期的な目線が必須であり、時間による変化に柔軟に対応できるものが効果的だろう。

In this paper, I present a case study of the challenges faced in the EFL courses in one nonspecialist university faculty in Japan. Today, the pressure on EFL education is increasing. On the one hand, reform in the direction of further internationalization is being demanded by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), with one of the two prongs of current reform strategies being the formation of Japan as a world-leading education hub (MEXT, 2015). On the other hand, more companies are requiring strong English skills, with some major corporations switching to English as their office lingua franca (Kobayashi, 2014; Norisada, 2012). However, although the goals are being set higher and higher, outside of elite institutions such as MEXT's Super Global Universities, many universities are still struggling with basic questions about how to improve regular EFL courses for mid- and lower level students. These struggles are often overlooked; properly approaching them may be the real key to improving Japanese English education. By analyzing how my faculty has dealt with some issues—in particular, commonality and consciousness of goals and the effectiveness of using a common textbook, the issues will come into relief. This paper will also offer some insight into how to improve problematic EFL programs.

EFL Courses in the Faculty: An Overview Background Information on the Faculty

The faculty of psychology at Rissho University, a mid-tier, semi-competitive comprehensive university, was formed in 2002. Currently, it is made up of two departments: the department of clinical psychology (CP), with a set goal of 150 students per matriculating class, and the department of interpersonal and social psychology (ISP), with a set goal of 100 students. The department of ISP opened in 2011. In 2015, the faculty accepted approximately 25% of all students who applied through the general admission exams, making it the most competitive of the university's eight faculties. As a relatively new faculty—and the newest within the university—the faculty of psychology has not yet

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

developed many binding cultural traditions. However, as a whole, the university should be described as conservative. Although Rishsho became a university in 1924, the university calls a Nichiren Buddhist school formed in 1872 its formal beginning, and its roots can be further traced back to 1580 in the form of an educational institution for Nichiren priests. The faculty may still be young, but the institution itself is steeped in tradition.

The ratio of students admitted through recommendation (a system in which students are semiautomatically accepted on the basis of their transcripts and a recommendation letter by their school's principal, followed by an essay exam and an interview) and through the general entrance exams is approximately one to two with a little less than half of all students—130 out of 273 in 2015—accepted through recommendation. At just six in 2015, few international students, returnees, or adult students are enrolled. Students' English abilities greatly depend upon how they gained admission, as appears to be typical (Kochiyama, 2010; Metoki, 2013). English is a required subject on the general entrance exams, but although students' academic records are taken into account in admission through recommendation, English is not necessarily prioritized. Students who gained admission through recommendation generally do not appear as confident or positive about English, and their ability is comparatively lower. In 2013, on the TOEIC Bridge examination students took immediately after matriculating, there was a 70 point TOEIC-adjusted score difference between the average scores of students admitted through recommendation and those of students admitted through the general entrance exam. Admissions criteria in Japan started to diversify—including the creation of alternate exam forms and the loosening of requirements for recommendation—in the late 1980s in order to decrease entrance exam stress, but as Mori (2002) noted, “one cannot avoid noticing the utilitarian motivation for these reforms; they are meant to increase student enrollments” (p. 37).

Student Satisfaction with EFL Courses

At present, students are required to take three English courses: English Reading I and II and English Writing I and II in their 1st year; English 3 in their 2nd year. The first four are one-semester courses, with I a prerequisite for the following II. English 3 is currently a full-year course focusing on speaking but will also become two semester courses in 2016 with the new names English Speaking I and II. Students receive 1 credit for each semester of course work, for a total of 6 required credits. Students enrolled after 2014 need 126 credits to graduate, making the EFL courses a small but significant presence in students' study, especially in the first 2 years. There are also several upper level elective courses offered: two psychology courses on reading articles in English—one each for CP

and ISP at 2 credits each, both of which count towards graduation; Advanced English/TOEIC I and II; Advanced English/Academic Writing I and II; and Practical English/Skype I and II, in which students learn conversational skills through Skype lessons with students in the Philippines. The Advanced courses and Practical English are each 1 credit per semester, but do not count towards graduation.

Unfortunately, although the faculty has tried to offer a variety of EFL courses, student satisfaction with them has been low. In a survey on the curriculum taken in 2013, student satisfaction with EFL was 20% lower than satisfaction with other general education courses and 40% lower than satisfaction with specialized subject courses. We knew that surveys of student satisfaction require critical analysis and noted the controversies surrounding evaluations and student learning, with some research pointing towards students *negatively* evaluating challenging courses that encouraged their learning (Braga, Paccagnella, & Pellizzari, 2014). However, students' negative attitudes towards EFL courses suggested that this was an issue too critical to ignore. As such, improvement of the EFL courses was brought up in the curriculum committee as a matter of imminent concern in 2013.

Assessing Curriculum Problems

As a first step to rectifying the situation, in 2013 members of the curriculum committee formed a working group consisting of the two full-time EFL instructors and one subject specialist. After an analysis of current course guidelines, syllabi, and students' comments from curriculum surveys, discussion in the group put into relief two major issues: (a) a lack of clear vision and curriculum guidelines and (b) weak links between the EFL courses. Although the required English courses were divided by the skills they sought to address (reading, writing, and speaking), this was not clear from their titles at that time (English 1, English 2, and English 3, respectively), and selection of course materials was left to instructors. As a result, teaching materials and styles were diffuse and decentralized, even within different sections of the same course. In addition, the link between courses was not immediately obvious to students: It was not clear from their titles, and there were no course guidelines that would allow for quick reference and planning. This was particularly problematic for the 2nd-year speaking courses, which ideally should pick up from their 1st-year courses, but in reality did not necessarily do so, meaning that there were few systematic chances to review previous materials.

The result was dramatic variation between different course sections. For example, in the reading courses some instructors choose to primarily study English literature, whereas others used newspaper articles or comics. This made course goals opaque for both stu-

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

dents and instructors. Because sections were assigned, students could not choose which one sounded most appropriate or interesting to them. Rather than being an opportunity to select a section which was more appropriate to their individual learning styles—which might be useful (Dunn & Dunn, 1979)—students were inclined to feel that which section they ended up with was a matter of luck. Differences between sections became apparent when students talked to each other, contributing to a sense that not enough was being done to establish fair educational opportunities. The lack of connection between courses also made it difficult for students to make long-term study plans, as the contents of each course depended on which section they were assigned to.

These issues may point to larger problems in a nonspecialist faculty. EFL courses are formally situated similarly to general education courses, separate from psychology subject courses. It is comparatively easy to set goals for the psychology courses. Certain guidelines must be followed for undergraduates to apply to be a licensed psychologist, meaning larger institutional demands necessitate the courses' centralization and standardization. Aside from generic goals such as higher scores on the TOEIC, students' learning outcomes are not as clear for EFL courses. Furthermore, language teachers often have an image problem (Byram & Risager, 1993). Although cultural dimensions are vital to language learning and most nonlanguage teachers agree that language learning is important, language courses are often assumed to be about the development of skills, rather than hard knowledge. This can give the sense that language courses are less prestigious than subject courses. Such distancing can contribute to the impression that EFL courses exist as an island outside of the faculty, which may account for some of the curriculum problems observed.

Overview and Analysis of Actions Taken and Their Results

Specific Actions Taken

The curriculum committee has been working to improve the EFL curriculum through six steps: (a) creating and clarifying EFL curriculum guidelines; (b) strengthening connections between courses; (c) adopting a common textbook; (d) switching from the TOEIC Bridge to TOEIC for post-matriculation tracking; and, for speaking courses, (e) assigning native speakers and (f) halving class sizes. The most crucial steps were (a) to (c), which I deal with below. As for the other points, the university switched to the TOEIC to facilitate tracking student progress following repeated requests from the faculty. Starting with the class of 2015, 2nd-year students will also take TOEIC at the beginning of the year. Additionally, although native English speakers are sometimes overprivileged (see Kachru & Nelson, 2006), given the differences in how native and nonnative speakers are viewed

by students (e.g., Shimizu, 1995), native speakers were selected for speaking courses so as to offer opportunities for different learning experiences and international interaction. The oral aspects of speaking courses were reinforced through smaller classes.

Redesigning the EFL Curriculum

The first step to creating curriculum guidelines was to reconsider the EFL needs of the psychology students. As noted earlier, there is a tendency to treat EFL courses as more peripheral than subject-matter courses. However, many CP students wish to enter graduate school to become licensed psychologists. This will usually require taking an entrance exam with an English component, making strong reading skills desirable. In graduate school, many students will also present at international conferences, necessitating the development of speaking and academic writing skills. Although most of the ISP students plan to seek work following graduation, good English skills and high TOEIC scores are increasingly helpful in job searches and can help students stand out in a tough market. Finally, given that a large percentage of the academic work on psychology is written in English, English reading skills are useful when doing senior thesis literature reviews. This all suggests that although comprehensive development of the four main skills is desirable, an academic focus would be particularly appropriate.

In light of these needs, we designed curriculum guidelines by summarizing the educational goals for each course, the connections between courses, and what materials would be used (see Appendix A, Tables A1 and A2). We also took the university's transitioning all full-year courses into consecutive semester-long courses as an opportunity to rename the courses to the skills to be developed. These guidelines were then used to set up a 4-year study plan (Appendix B, Tables A3 and A4). Both the guidelines and the study plan were purposefully left somewhat ambiguous. Rather than set unrealistic goals, we assumed that the first attempt might not sufficiently answer all of the problems being faced and determined that some leeway was essential to allow for continued adjustment.

Picking a Common Textbook

On the ground, the adoption of a common textbook was the single largest change. The faculty decided to use a common textbook so as to set common goals and lessen the differences between course sections, as well as to increase student motivation and encourage the development of personal study plans through increased transparency. Since the reading and writing courses are taken simultaneously, we decided that the same materials should be used for both courses to increase students' opportunities for review. Fur-

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

thermore, as the 2nd-year speaking course is taken following the other two, series-based textbooks that would build on their 1st-year work were believed to offer the best continuity for students; series using the same chapter themes were deemed particularly desirable. Additionally, we limited the search to textbooks adapted to TOEIC levels, in order to use students' average TOEIC scores (pre-2015, adjusted from the TOEIC Bridge) as a guideline. Ultimately, we chose a series aimed somewhat above the average scores in order to offer sufficient stimulus to all students. In the first year (2014), we also created a common syllabus for the three required EFL courses. To allow for flexibility during the initial year, use of the common syllabus was originally optional; however, from the 2015 school year, it was made obligatory. The syllabus sets common grading standards, as well as learning goals for each course and a yearly schedule, thus contributing to the courses' standardization. (Individual instructors can add personalized comments in a section for instructors' notes.)

Finally, prior to adopting the textbook in the 2014 school year, at the end of the 2013 school year we held an information session for all EFL instructors. For many instructors, the common textbook presented a new challenge. At present (2015) the required EFL courses are taught by 17 (18 at the time of the survey) different instructors, the majority of which—15—are adjuncts. Previous to these changes, many instructors had been teaching for a long time and had established their own teaching styles and routines. In addition, the textbook included optional online study tools, and its full utilization required at least limited computer use, which many instructors reported feeling uncomfortable with. The goals of the information session were to introduce the textbook and its characteristics to the instructors, explain the need for a common textbook, and offer a space for instructors to interact.

Evaluating Changes in the Faculty

As can be expected, some problems were quickly noticed after we began using the textbook. The major problems related to the university facilities were a limited number of computer rooms, which were not well adapted for use with digital materials. Some instructors also reported that the high level of the textbook made it difficult for some classes, thus limiting consistency between course sections. CP has one high-level section based upon 1st-year students' TOEIC scores, but the other CP sections, and all of the ISP sections, are divided in order by student numbers. Because students are assigned numbers as soon as they fill out the admissions paperwork and the recommendation period is earlier than the general entrance exams, student numbers correlate with how students gained admission. Given that it can encourage negative social comparison (Ames, 1992),

we have avoided describing the sections as being tiered by ability; however, the differences in ability between students admitted through different criteria means that the sections are in practice organized by level. The textbook selected is more in tune with the level of the students entering through the general exams. However, after an initial period of adjustment, many instructors reported feeling that the textbook was easy to use and at an appropriate level for most students. Improvements have also been made to the facilities: In the following year, the curriculum committee specifically requested classrooms with instructor computers for all EFL courses and added the online study program to the faculty's public computers.

One point less well established, however, was how the changes affected students. To assess whether using a common textbook had improved student satisfaction and increased course consistency, we conducted a survey at the end of the 2014 school year. The survey was held in most of the EFL required courses and garnered 711 student replies. It focused on students' feelings of improvement and textbook use, including how many assignments they received and how the textbook was utilized. It also asked 2nd-year students what differences they perceived between the 1st- and 2nd-year courses, before and after we began using the common textbook. Most of the 2nd-year students—201 out of 280 replies—reported not feeling that there was a major difference between the two years. This is not surprising, given the differing goals of the 1st- and 2nd-year courses. However, the 73 students who felt there was a difference focused on several positives, such as how they were able to talk more about English courses with other students (37), demonstrating how using a common textbook allows students to collaborate, even with students in other course sections. In addition, nine students reported that the new textbook made assignments clearer and that it was easy to use. At least for some students, the textbook seemed to be successful in encouraging students to communicate amongst themselves and clarifying how classes would proceed.

However, using a common textbook also had the unexpected result of putting instructor differences into relief. Although complaints previously focused on content, students' complaints now appear to have been refocused on assignments—in particular, the number of homework assignments given—and on differing teaching styles. In the free response area, many students mentioned feeling a sense of inequality between classes—and indeed, when students were asked to self-report how often they were given assignments, we found that only eight of the 18 instructors regularly assigned assignments, and four rarely did. Previously, students may not have been as sensitive to these differences because the materials they were using were not identical. However, now that there is a common textbook and common learning goals it may be easier for students to compare

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

course sections. This is not necessarily a bad thing. Although it was previously difficult to ascertain the nature of students' dissatisfaction, the common textbook has made it easier for students to articulate what they perceive as issues, allowing for better follow-up.

In regards to assignments, for example, more communication from the curriculum committee about the required out-of-classroom learning time per credit appears to be in order. However, these last points come back to a major recurring issue: the validity of a common curriculum with a diffuse staff. Presently the majority of classes are taught by adjuncts, with just 8 out of 43 total classes taught by full-time faculty members. Although it would be desirable to work together as a team to design a better EFL curriculum, that may not be realistic—ethically or financially, in the sense of supplying adequate compensation for such efforts—under the current working conditions. In 2015, furthermore, 17 instructors taught an average of 2.53 sections each, meaning that there are many different teaching styles within the faculty, even for the same course. This problem only became clearer by using a common textbook and will not likely disappear without some effort.

Reflecting on Change: Improvements and Continuing Issues

Given that the largest change has been the adoption of a common textbook, one might say that we are currently overly reliant on it as a source of change. Naturally, this means that we are dependent on the stability of the publisher and the materials they offer—and indeed, the online system offered by the publisher changed suddenly in the 2015 school year, requiring renewed follow-up. This suggests the importance of determining long-term goals and moving away from stop-gap solutions towards creating clearer educational guidelines for courses. Part of this will mean better support and clarification of the needs of adjunct instructors.

Given the particularities of different universities and faculties, it is not clear how generalizable the lessons learnt from our experiences are. Reliance on adjunct instructors and nonstandardized EFL curricula are, however, common issues, and at least some of the lessons learnt here should be informative. At least for our faculty, using a common textbook has served as a catalyst for considering long-term goals. Although there are still problems to be addressed, our efforts appear to have paid off at least in part, with complaints about EFL courses less frequent in the 2014 curriculum survey. Improving the program will clearly be a long-term process, requiring a deep commitment and dedication of time; each effort brings new issues, but also helps to establish more appropriate goals for EFL courses in the faculty of psychology. Currently, our next step is to conduct surveys amongst 1st-year students starting in April 2016. By doing so, we hope to better

ascertain student attitudes and when their dissatisfaction with EFL courses begins. Additionally, one long-term goal slowly taking form is to create unique materials for the faculty of psychology. Currently, the common textbook covers topics in the liberal arts and social sciences but not exclusively psychology. Several students requested the use of psychology texts in the textbook survey, pointing towards desire for more content-based learning. Not only would this be in line with current EFL trends—with research suggesting that content-based learning improves student attitudes and motivations (e.g., Lasagabaster & Sierra, 2009)—but it would also help integrate EFL courses into the larger curriculum, an important issue yet to be properly addressed. Given that one of the problems with EFL courses in a non-EFL faculty is the lack of connection between them and the subject-based curriculum, use of psychology-based materials might be one way to help increase their relevance for students.

Bio Data

Giancarla Unser-Schutz is an assistant professor at Rissho University. She is currently interested in how to improve motivation and interest amongst students in non-EFL-specialist faculties. She also conducts research outside of EFL on the linguistic characteristics of *manga* as well as Japanese naming practices. Her publications may be found at <<http://rissho.academia.edu/GiancarlaUnserSchutz/>>. <giancarlaunserchutz@ris.ac.jp>

References

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 267-271. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.84.3.261>
- Braga, M., Paccagnella, M., & Pellizzari, M. (2014). Evaluating students' evaluations of professors. *Economics of Education Review, 41*, 71-88. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2014.04.002>
- Byram, M., & Risager, K. (1993). *Language teachers, politics and cultures*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1979). Learning styles/teaching styles: Should they . . . can they . . . be matched? *Educational Leadership, 36*, 238-244.
- Kachru, Y., & Nelson, C. L. (2006). *World Englishes in Asian contexts*. Hong Kong, China: Hong Kong University Press.
- Kobayashi, K. (2014). Eigo shanai kouyougoka ni kansuru ikkousatsu [A study on "Englishnization" in Japanese companies]. *Kinki Daigaku Bungei Gakubu Ronshū* [Bulletin of the School of Literature, Arts and Cultural Studies, Kinki University], 26(1), 142-122. Retrieved from <http://kurepo.lib.kindai.ac.jp/modules/xoonips/download.php?file_id=11725>

Unser-Schutz: *Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study*

Kochiyama, A. (2010). Shinnyuusei no eigo nouryoku to nyuushi keitai oyobi douki-zuke ni kansuru chousa [A study on the English ability of Wayo freshman: Focusing on their entrance exam type and motivation]. *Wayou Josei Daigaku Kiyou* [The Journal of Wayo Women's University], 50, 93-101 Retrieved from <https://wayo.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=928&file_id=22&file_no=1>

Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2009). Language attitudes in CLIL and traditional FL classes. *International Journal of CLIL Research*, 1(2), 4-17. Retrieved from <http://www.icrj.eu/12/article1.html>

Metoki, M. (2013). T-daigaku ni okeru nyuugaku keitai to gakusei no eigoryoku no kankei [The relationship between the types of university entrance examinations and Japanese students' English proficiency in T University]. *Tenshi Daigaku Kiyou* [Bulletin of Tenshi College], 14(2): 53-60. Retrieved from <https://tenshi.repo.nii.ac.jp/?action=repository_uri&item_id=254&file_id=22&file_no=1>

MEXT. (2015). *Kokkouritsu daigaku o tsuujita daigaku kyouiku saisei no senryakuteki suishin* [The strategic promotion of university education revitalization through public and national universities]. Retrieved from <http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/koutou/kaikaku/index.htm>

Mori, R. (2002). Entrance examinations and remedial education in Japanese higher education. *Higher Education*, 43, 27-42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1012999527910>

Norisada, T. (2012). Eigo no shanai kouyougoka wo kangaeru [On English as a corporate official language]. *Shougaku Ronkyuu* [Journal of business administration of Kwansai Gakuin University], 59(4), 1-32. Retrieved from <http://kgur.kwansei.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/10236/8807/1/59-4-1.pdf>

Shimizu, K. (1995). Japanese college student attitudes towards English teachers: A survey. *The Language Teacher*, 19(10), 5-10.

Appendix A
Curriculum Guidelines

Table A1: Curriculum Guidelines (Japanese)

科目	目的	他の科目との関連性	教材
English Reading I・II	中学・高校で勉強した文法を再確認した上で、新聞や雑誌などを読み、それら出現する自然な構文・単語を学習する。3～4段落の新聞記事や論文抜粋が速やかに読め、またその内容を理解することを、最終的な目標として目指す。	English Writing: English Writing I・IIでの要約等に向けて、適切な共通教材の読解に努める English Speaking: 日常的な会話を行うために必要な単語・文法取得を意識した位置づけ Advanced English: 高度な英語文献を読むのに必要な基礎的な読解スキルを磨く	共通性を優先し、English Reading・Writing・Speakingは同じシリーズの教科書もしくは同教科書を全コマに活用すること
English Writing I・II	読書した文書に対して、速やかかつ正確に自分の意見をまとめたり、3～4段落の感想文を執筆したりすることで、自ら学習した構文や新しい単語を活用し、その取得を促進する。	English Reading: 原則として、English Writing Iと同じ教材に基づいて、自分の意見(感想)をまとめる・教材の要約に努める English Speaking: スピーキング科目に向けて英語で会話を行うために必要な自己表現を文書にて練習する	
English Speaking I・II	海外留学や卒業後の仕事に必要な日常会話スキルを磨きながら、英語で自分の意見・意思等を口頭で速やかかつスムーズに伝えられるようになることを目標とする。	English Reading/Writing: 1年次のときに学習した構文・単語を基礎に口頭表現の練習に努める Practical English: さらに高度な会話ができるよう、日常生活において求められる基礎的な口頭表現の取得を促進	
Advanced English I・II (TOEIC対策講座)	就職活動や海外留学に不可欠な資格となりつつあるTOEICを受けるためのトレーニングをする。とくにリスニング、リーディングのスキルに力を入れ、TOEIC受験対策を戦略的に学ぶ。	English Reading/Writing: 1年次のときに学習した構文・単語、2年次のときに到達させたりリスニングスキルを基礎に、TOEICを受験するためのスキルアップを促進する	TOEICに使われる過去問題等
Advanced English I・II (学術英語講座)	卒業論文の文献調査や大学院入試の英語質疑の準備に向けて、高度な学術論文の読解スキルを磨く。それに向けて、入試同様に、1～2ページの抜粋を速やかに(1時間以内に)読み、要約する能力を身につけることを目指す。	English Reading/Writing: 1年次のときに学習した構文・単語を基礎に、高度な学術論文の読解に努める	過去の大学院入試に使用された論文や、基礎論文集からの抜粋
Practical English I・II	自然な会話ができる外国人と英語で会話をするにより、実践的な英語コミュニケーション力を上達させる。	English Speaking: 2年次の必須科目で学習した口頭表現をもとに、コミュニケーション能力の上達に努める	基本的に協定先の大学が用意する

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

Table A2: Curriculum Guidelines (English)

Course	Goals	Connection to other classes	Materials
English Reading I/II	While reviewing grammar forms learned in junior and senior high school, students will read newspapers and magazine articles and study naturalistic forms and vocabulary featured therein. The final goal will be to be able to quickly read and understand 3~4 paragraph newspaper articles and article excerpts.	<p>English Writing: Students will read appropriate materials in order to complete their summaries in English Writing.</p> <p>English Speaking: Students will consciously work on acquiring the vocabulary and grammatical forms necessary for daily conversation.</p> <p>Advanced English: Students will acquire the reading skills necessary to go on to read advanced English materials.</p>	To prioritize continuity, English Reading, Writing and Speaking will use the same textbook and/or textbook series.
English Writing I/II	By quickly and accurately writing their own opinions and thoughts about materials they have read, students will actively use the forms and new vocabulary they have studied, thus encouraging their acquisition.	<p>English Reading: In principle, the same materials will be used, and students will work on writing their opinions and thoughts and summarizing the materials.</p> <p>English Speaking: Students will study how to appropriately express themselves in writing, creating a base for speaking courses.</p>	
English Speaking I/II	While acquiring the speaking skills necessary to conduct basic conversation while studying abroad or conducting work post-graduation, students will learn how to quickly and smoothly express their thoughts and will.	<p>English Reading/Writing: Students will work on reviewing and applying the forms and vocabulary they studied in their first year in oral conversation form.</p> <p>Practical English: Students will acquire the basic speaking skills necessary in everyday life so they may move on to higher level conversations.</p>	
Advanced English I/II (TOEIC strategies)	Students will train for the TOEIC exam, now increasingly necessary when job hunting and studying abroad. In particular, they will strategically study the listening and reading skills required for the TOEIC exam.	<p>English Reading/Writing: Using the grammatical forms and vocabulary studied in their first year and the listening skills acquired in their second year as a base, students will continue to advance their skills for for the TOEIC exam.</p>	TOEIC exams from previous years, etc.
Advanced English I/II (Academic English)	Students will acquire the reading skills necessary to read high-level academic articles, as necessary for doing a literature review for undergraduate theses and graduate school entrance exams. As in the entrance exams, students will quickly (less than 1 hour) reading 1 or 2 page excerpts and establishing the summarizing skills necessary.	<p>English Reading/Writing: Using the grammatical forms and vocabulary studied in their first year as a base, students will develop advanced reading academic reading skills.</p>	Articles used in previous entrance exams, excerpts from core articles
Practical English I/II	Students will improve their practical English communication skills by participating in conversation with foreigners fluent in naturalistic conversation.	<p>English Speaking: Students will work on improving their communication skills while using the oral expressions students studied in their second year required course.</p>	Generally supplied by the partner university

Unser-Schutz: Improving a University English Program: Issues From One Case Study

Appendix B
Study Plans
Table B1: 4-Year Study Plan (Japanese)

年次	取得科目 (◎=必須)	スキル	位置付け・説明
1年次	◎English Reading I・II ◎English Writing I・II	基礎的なリーディングとライティング	基礎的な文法・単語の再確認と更なる取得を目指し、2年次のスピーキング科目 (English Speaking I・II) に向けて、テキストのテーマに合わせた文章作成の練習をする
2年次	◎English Speaking I・II Practical English	スピーキング、 実践的な コミュニケーション	日常生活に関する各テーマを取り扱いながら、1年次で学習した構文・単語を会話の中で活用し、口頭で自分の意見等を積極的にまとめて表現することを目指す
3年次	Advanced English I・II Practical English I・II	高度な読解力、 実践的な コミュニケーション	就職活動に必要なTOEIC受験の戦略的な学習を促進する他に、卒業論文の文献や大学院入試の質疑に必要な高度な読解力を取得する
4年次			

Table B2: 4-Year Study Plan (English)

Year	Course (◎ = Required)	Skills	Positioning/Explanation
First	◎English Reading I/II ◎English Writing I/II	Basic reading and writing skills	While further improving their acquisition of basic grammatical forms and vocabulary, and training for the second year speaking courses, students will practice reading and writing about texts on different themes.
Second	◎English Speaking I/II Practical English I/II	Speaking skills, practical communication skills	Taking up themes from everyday life, students will use the grammatical forms and vocabulary they studied in their first year, and aim to express themselves and actively state their opinions orally in English.
Third	Advanced English I/II Practical English I/II	Advanced reading skills, practical communication skills	While advancing their strategic study for the TOEIC exams necessary for job hunting, students will acquire the high-level reading skills necessary for their undergraduate theses and graduate school entrance exams.
Fourth			