

**UTILIZATION-FOCUSED EVALUATION FOR PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT:
THE NEED FOR TEACHING EXPERIENCE WITHIN THE BACHELOR
OF ARTS PROGRAM IN SECOND LANGUAGE STUDIES**

SENA PIERCE

University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this evaluation was to investigate (a) if there was a need for students in a new Bachelor of Arts (BA) program in Second Language Studies (SLS) to gain teaching experience and, if so, (b) how best to meet the need. The project followed a utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) design with the end goal of evaluation use for program development. Evaluation questions were addressed in two phases; the first aimed to determine if students needed to gain teaching experience as a component of the BA degree in SLS, while the second aimed to determine the degree and type of support needed for students to gain teaching experience should it be a need. Data was collected from SLS BA students ($n= 35$) and faculty ($n = 13$) in an iterative process using the following instruments: anonymous web-based surveys, focus groups, group interview, and a Delphi technique. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and thematic coding. Findings indicated that the gaining of teaching experience was a perceived need for most students in the BA program, though not a universal need. Also, findings suggested that the SLS Department should provide support for students to gain teaching or related professional experience, and ideally this support would be a professional practicum or internship course open to both teaching and non-teaching students. An additional and unexpected finding revealed that stakeholders held different conceptions of students' professional identity within the degree, perhaps related to changes occurring in the Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) field. Consequently, the present study explored the use of UFE as a means of program understanding and self-exploration at a time of transition within SLTE.

INTRODUCTION

The Department of Second Language Studies (SLS) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa has been a strong figure at the University, and in the TESOL field, from its beginnings in the 1960s. Since that time the programs offered by the department, including a master of arts, graduate certificate, and doctorate in SLS, have evolved to meet student needs and changes in

departmental direction. In the fall of 2011, the newest evolution took place with the inauguration of the Bachelor of Arts (BA) program in SLS. With the introduction of the BA program, the SLS Department became responsible for the matriculation and academic development of a new student population. In an on-going effort to ensure that the new program was meeting the expectations of both the SLS Department and the newly enrolled students, program administrators requested an evaluation during the first year of program implementation, to look specifically at the potential need for students to gain teaching experience as a component of the program.

The BA program in SLS is not a second language teacher education (SLTE) degree. However, it mirrors major components of SLTE programs, including the development of students' proficiency in linguistic content in addition to second language learning and teaching (Graves, 2009). For this reason, and in order to better understand questions about students' professional identities that emerged during the evaluation process, it is helpful to situate the SLS BA program within the SLTE field for the purposes of this project.

Second Language Teacher Education

Historically, SLTE grew out of linguistics and applied linguistics, and has generally had two distinct arms of curricular content, language and teaching. In early models, students would learn language content and teaching methodology and put it together in a practicum or on the job (Graves, 2009, p.17). As the field developed, trends in general education, such as reflective teaching and teachers' prior knowledge, began to influence SLTE through the 1980s and 1990s, culminating in Freeman and Johnson's (1998) game-changing proposal to reconsider what constitutes the core competencies of SLTE programs. Freeman and Johnson argued that SLTE programs needed to consider students in relation to their learning and in consideration of the social contexts in which they would teach. More importantly, they situated learning to teach as the central component of SLTE. Yates and Muckisy (2003) countered Freeman and Johnson's argument and claimed that a focus on learning to teach marginalized language in SLTE programs. Further, they argued that the study of language and second language acquisition (SLA) must remain central to SLTE following the analogy: "How can you teach math if you don't know math yourself?" (p. 145).

The debate between these two camps (e.g., Bartels, 2004; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Freeman & Johnson, 2004; Muckisky & Yates, 2004; Yates & Muckisky, 2003) highlighted a tension in the field of SLTE that is akin to a professional identity crisis between developing language professionals and developing teaching professionals. Kathleen Graves (2009) however, identified this tension as a shift in the field and noted, “pedagogical content knowledge began to blur the boundaries between ‘content’ and ‘skills’. Subject matter could not be divorced from how to teach it.” (p. 118). Following a review of the past 25 years of research in SLTE, Wright (2010) supported Graves and concluded SLTE is an “enterprise in transition” (p. 288). He identified a handful of clear shifts in SLTE pedagogy which included an emerging emphasis on learning to teach, reflective practice, and learning through experience, all of which appear to support Freeman and Johnson’s call for a teaching core within SLTE. Wright also found that change in SLTE was not widespread and depended, among other things, on local factors such as politics, culture, society, and institutions (p. 288). Following this finding, he called for more research at points of innovation, both to understand potential issues and to inform emerging theories of learning and professional identity.

The present evaluation responds to Wright’s (2010) call for research at points of innovation by describing a process of program development within the BA program in SLS. Important to note, the question of professional identity emerged as an unexpected and critical focal point within the evaluation process and findings. For this reason, the present study offers not only a model of evaluation in practice, but also an example of using evaluation for program level self-exploration and understanding at a time of transition within the SLTE field.

Utilization-Focused Evaluation

There are many definitions of evaluation and equally as many uses for evaluation in practice. For the purposes of this study, evaluation is loosely defined as the systematic collection of information for the primary purposes of making value-based judgments, improvements, or decisions about a program (Norris, 2006; Patton, 1996). This wide definition encompasses a continuum of research practices that have been adopted over an iterative history of evaluation in language education and SLTE. Though early evaluations were positivistic and concerned largely with theory testing (Berretta, 1992), in recent years, evaluation use has diversified and begun to

play an integral role in language program assessment and accountability, program improvement, and program development (Kiely & Rea-Dickens, 2005; Norris, Davis, Sinicrope & Watanabe, 2009).

The adoption of evaluation practices to inform various levels of program improvement, assessment, and development is not a new idea. Brown's (1995) model of curriculum development described evaluation as a continual process throughout all stages of an educational program and argued it is what "gives meaning to all the other elements" (p. 217). Earlier evaluation approaches described by Brown, including product-, process-, and decision-oriented approaches, articulated the steps and stages of evaluation design for different purposes. Though these models provided administrators a place to start, they did not ensure that information collected within an evaluation would be immediately useful to those employing it, potentially leading to non-use of evaluation findings. The non-use of evaluation findings has remained a persistent challenge in both language education and mainstream program evaluation (Norris, 2006; Patton, 2008). Offering a response to this challenge, Patton (1997) promoted utilization-focused evaluation (UFE) as an adaptive model embodying the field's principal standard of utility for evaluation quality (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1994). The centrality of evaluation *use* suggests that all decisions throughout the evaluation process ensure, to the extent possible, the utilization of the evaluation by the primary intended users. In application, use is ensured by involving primary intended users in decision making throughout the evaluation process (Patton, 2008, p. 37), essentially placing those intended to use the information in the driver's seat. Equally important for the present evaluation, UFE is a versatile and adaptive approach appropriate for all evaluative purposes, including program development. For example, a recent published collection of evaluations modeling UFE approaches included evaluation for curriculum development, program redirection, impact evaluation, program assessment, and outcomes evaluation (Norris et al., 2009).

There are limited published models of evaluation in SLTE; however, two recent examples help illustrate the appropriateness of a UFE approach for development within SLTE programs. For example, Peacock (2009) evaluated a TESOL BA program in Hong Kong for the purposes of overall program assessment and the secondary aim of developing institutional capacity for formative program assessment. Peacock's approach drew from Robinson's (2003) definition of

evaluation as the collection of information in order to make judgments about the value of a program. This approach lacks reference to expected use for the collected information, increasing the potential for the evaluation to end up on a shelf rather than driving program-level decision making. Thus, though Peacock's (2009) evaluation findings provided a great amount of global information about the program, there was no discussion regarding how this information was useful to, or used by program decision makers.

In contrast, Zannirato and Sánchez-Serrano (2009) conducted a use-focused evaluation to assess the need for, and feasibility of developing a training program for graduate teaching assistants (GTA) in the German and Romance Languages and Literatures Department at John Hopkins University. Early in evaluation process, an independent assessment at the university level determined a GTA training program was needed within the department. This essentially shifted the primary goal of the evaluation from feasibility assessment to program development. Responding to this shift in focus, the principal investigators identified new primary intended users who were in positions to use findings for program development. Likewise they rearticulated the primary intended uses of the evaluation based on the shift in users to further promote evaluation use. Thus, at the close of the project, the evaluation findings guided the design of a new GTA training program that received approval by the department's executive committee; in other words, findings were clearly used.

The primary goals of these evaluations in SLTE were different from each other. However, the comparison demonstrates how a UFE approach promoted the collection of information for specific uses, ultimately resulting in evaluation findings that proved immediately useful to program administrators. Following Zannirato and Sánchez-Serrano (2009), the present evaluation employed a UFE approach to investigate the potential need for BA students in SLS to gain teaching experience within the program, as well as ways to potentially meet this need.

The evaluation is presented here in response to the urgent call for models and examples of evaluation in practice within the field of second language education (Norris, 2009; Elder, 2009), specifically SLTE. Additionally, the project explored utilization-focused evaluation as a process for program self-exploration and understanding at a time of transition in the SLTE field.

PROGRAM AND EVALUATION CONTEXT

Program Description

The BA program in SLS is new and first began accepting enrollments in the fall semester of academic year 2011-2012. Though prior to this term students did not have the option to major in SLS, undergraduate courses in the Department had been offered for over forty years. Before the introduction of a BA program in SLS, undergraduate students interested in the field were able to major in Interdisciplinary Studies with a focus in SLS (IS/SLS). For this reason most of the courses that composed the new program already existed, with developed syllabi and course-level student learning outcomes (SLOs). As a full undergraduate program in SLS, only one new course was added to the program: SLS 480P, “Professionalism in SLS”, a 400-level (senior-level) course and the capstone for the degree. The formal proposal for the program estimated initial student enrollment would be equal to previous enrollment in IS/SLS and conservatively estimated a 4% growth over the first years of the program, reaching 45 enrolled students by the program’s sixth year (Department of Second Language Studies, 2011). Interest in the program far exceeded expectations, though, reaching over 60 enrollments within the program’s inaugural year, fifteen times the expected yearly growth.

Two Department of SLS staff members administer the program and serve as the program’s undergraduate academic advisors. Additionally, these staff members manage the University’s English Language Institute (ELI). In order to meet the administrative needs of both programs, each staff member took on the primary support of one of the programs, serving as backup for the other. Under this arrangement, one SLS staff member supports the BA program nearly full-time while also serving as backup support for the ELI. The other staff member provides back-up support for the BA program primarily through student advising and instruction as needed.

Undergraduate students majoring in SLS are expected to complete 24 required credits (eight courses) and nine elective credits (three courses) for a total of 33 credits in the Department. Courses are taught by both tenured and non-tenured Department of SLS faculty members and instructors, and SLS doctoral students. However, a majority of the courses are currently taught by SLS doctoral students.

The primary mission of the BA program is “to provide students with a comprehensive understanding of scholarship and application in the learning and use of second languages” (Department of Second Language Studies, 2011, p. 3). Graduates of the degree are expected to contribute to language education in the local Hawai‘i context in addition to language education and other language professions internationally. The BA degree also has the potential to serve as a feeder for the department’s well-known graduate program or other graduate programs in applied linguistics. A set of program-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) are intended to guide curriculum, courses, and student expectations. The SLOs are broad and aim to develop student knowledge and skills in SLS research, theory, and pedagogy with particular consideration for professional development and the sociopolitical context of language learning. The program-level SLOs are included in Appendix 1.

Evaluation Purpose

One of the goals of the BA program in SLS is to develop students professionally. This emphasis is repeated in the program’s mission, goals, and SLOs. It is also a focus of the degree’s capstone course (the aforementioned SLS 480P). As SLS undergraduate courses had been offered for many years, SLS BA program administrators had an anecdotal understanding that many incoming students to the program intended to pursue careers in language teaching. This understanding was also supported in a survey of IS/SLS students prior to introduction of the SLS BA degree. Accordingly, the BA Program Coordinator expressed an initial concern during the first year of program implementation that there may be a need, benefit, or value for students to gain teaching or related experience that was not being met within the current structure of the program. This concern spurred interest in an evaluation to investigate if there was a need for students to gain teaching or related experience while completing their degree in SLS, and if it was determined to be a need, what the best way to meet this need might be.

Primary Intended Users

The primary intended users (PIUs) of the evaluation were decided in consultation with program administrators following a stakeholder analysis. The two program administrators were quickly identified as the individuals in the best position to make use of evaluation findings and

were selected as the PIUs of the evaluation. As such, they were involved at all levels of decision making throughout the course of the evaluation, including: articulation of the evaluation questions, data collection methods, interpretation, and reporting. A BA Committee made up of tenured and non-tenured faculty, doctoral student BA instructors, and BA advisors, was identified by the PIUs as secondary user of the evaluation. Though not explicitly involved in decision making during the course of the evaluation, efforts were made to ensure BA committee members were involved in instrument development and data collection. Additionally, the BA committee was the focus audience for evaluation reporting.

Primary Intended Uses and Evaluation Questions

In consultation with PIUs, the primary intended use of this evaluation was to make decisions regarding whether, and the extent to which, BA students should gain teaching experience while completing an undergraduate degree in SLS. A second intended use was to make decisions about the degree and type of structure needed to support students to gain teaching experience in order to develop this within the program. The second use of the evaluation for program development would only come into play if program administrators decided that gaining teaching experience was an actual/priority need for SLS BA students. For this reason the project was carried out in two phases. The evaluation questions driving the first phase were:

EQ1 To what extent does gaining teaching experience fit within program goals, SLOs, and existing course syllabi of the BA program in SLS?

EQ2 To what extent do students and faculty believe gaining teaching experience is necessary for SLS BA students?

After data collection and analysis addressing these two questions, initial findings were discussed with the program administrators, and priorities for the second phase of the project were established. The following evaluation questions were then addressed in the second phase of the evaluation:

EQ3 What constitutes a meaningful teaching experience for SLS BA students?

EQ4 What support do students and faculty perceive students need from the SLS department to gain teaching experience within the BA program?

EQ5 What are possible constraints or limitations to supporting the most viable options for students to gain teaching experience?

METHODS

Participants

Potential evaluation participants were identified in consultation with the PIUs and consisted of key BA program stakeholders including undergraduate students with declared majors in SLS, former IS/SLS students, BA program advisors, and BA course instructors. The BA course instructors included tenured and non-tenured faculty members and SLS doctoral students who taught SLS undergraduate courses within three semesters prior to the evaluation. Throughout this report “faculty” is used as an umbrella term to include tenured and non-tenured SLS faculty, doctoral student BA instructors, and SLS BA advisors. Former IS/SLS students were later dropped from the evaluation due to low response rates, which is further discussed in the findings section.

Potential evaluation participants were sent an introductory message describing the evaluation and its purpose via email by the Program Director. Following this step during phase one, the Director sent links to separate anonymous web-based surveys to all potential participants. The initial involvement of the Program Director in contacting potential participants ensured the privacy of participants, particularly students, and also encouraged participation in the evaluation.

Data Collection

Data collection methods were selected in consultation with program administrators to ensure that, as much as possible, findings led to the intended uses of the evaluation. Moreover, data collection was iterative, beginning in phase one with a document analysis of program literature followed by anonymous web-based surveys. A Delphi technique, focus groups, and a group interview were then employed in phase two to corroborate and expand phase one findings.

Document analysis. The first step of the evaluation was a review of program level documents that were publicly available on the BA program’s website and provided by the Program Director. Excluding descriptive information about the program on the departmental

website and a promotional pamphlet, most of the documents included in the review were internal and not available for public consumption, for example course syllabi. Documents were initially reviewed to gain a better understanding of the program goals and organization. Following this step, the documents were combed for explicit and implicit reference to teaching experience, or the gaining of teaching experience within the BA program. Findings were then checked with PIUs who were also very familiar with the documents.

Surveys. Surveys were selected as the most appropriate instrument to capture the perceptions and opinions of a majority of stakeholders. The surveys employed in the evaluation were developed specifically for the project and did not draw from existing instruments. For this reason they were piloted in an interview format with representative members of each respondent group and reviewed by evaluator peers and two survey design experts. The final student survey consisted of 13 multiple-choice, rating scale, and open-ended response questions. The final faculty survey consisted of 12 similar questions. Five questions were repeated on both surveys for later comparison. The survey questions addressed: (a) student and faculty experience with teaching, (b) perceptions about the need for students to gain teaching experience, (c) perceptions of students' abilities to gain and learn from teaching experience, (d) preference for departmental support options, and (e) demographic information about respondents. Rating scale questions on the surveys followed a five-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). The final survey instruments are included in Appendix 2. The open-ended comments on the surveys were coded and organized by common themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1990) and later discussed with program administrators as a cross-check.

Delphi technique. Following analysis of survey data and consultation with program administrators, a Delphi technique was adopted in order to clarify conceptual ideas of *teaching experience* and *meaningful teaching experience* in the BA program. The Delphi technique was selected because it can be used to clarify and develop consensus around complex ideas (Turoff & Linstone, 2002). In addition, the process can be conducted via email and is therefore manageable for faculty with minimal time to participate.

The technique consisted of three rounds of response and item ranking activities, which built upon each other and were conducted entirely over email. Informed consent was solicited and received via email and all responses and comments submitted by participants were kept

anonymous. In the first round, the evaluator gathered participant responses to two conceptual questions. In the second round, the collected responses were returned to the participant group anonymously to be ranked on a four-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*). In the final round, ranked responses were returned to the participant group for re-ranking, this time on a five-point Likert scale to encourage greater diversity in the ranking. Typically, the same Likert scale would be used throughout; however, as the rankings were not compared between rounds, the change did not impact the overall process. The instructions provided to Delphi technique participants are included in Appendix 3.

Focus groups. Three focus groups were held with faculty and students following analysis of survey and Delphi technique data and they were used primarily to corroborate Delphi results and clarify potentially ambiguous findings in the survey data. The focus group protocol can be found in Appendix 4. Initially, two faculty focus groups were held, one with doctoral student BA instructors and the other with tenured and non-tenured faculty instructors and BA advisors. To avoid confusion in the discussion of findings, the focus group of tenured and non-tenured faculty instructors and BA advisors is referred to as the *Advisor* group. After analysis of the PhD and Advisor focus groups, a third focus group was held with BA students to compare responses.

Seven PhD students, five tenured and non-tenured faculty and BA advisors, and two BA students participated in the three separate focus groups. Due to low participation in the student focus group, the session was conducted as a group interview and responses were used limitedly to clarify findings in the other sessions.

Data analysis. Analysis of the various data sources, like the data collection, was an iterative process. For example, initial findings of the document analysis were reviewed with PIUs which led to the formation of survey questions. Survey data was then analyzed using descriptive statistics and used to clarify and expand upon findings from the document analysis. Additionally, survey findings highlighted potentially problematic ambiguity in faculty's definition of teaching experience, which was then further explored in the Delphi technique. Data from the Delphi technique were analyzed initially using descriptive statistics, though findings were murky due to overlapping definitions of teaching experience. Therefore an additional analysis was used to identify repeated elements within the top ranked definitions of teaching experience. These repeated elements were then checked with faculty members in focus groups, many of whom had

also participated in the Delphi technique. In addition to checking faculty agreement with the Delphi technique results, focus groups were held to clarify ambiguity in survey findings. Focus group data was analyzed using a long-table approach (Krueger & Casey, 2000) to identify majority views, alignment, and areas of discrepancy within and between focus groups. Summaries of the data and general analysis were provided to focus group participants for review, and findings were interpreted with PIUs. Data from the student group interview were coded and reviewed for common themes which were then referenced to better understand survey and focus group findings.

EVALUATION FINDINGS: PHASE ONE

The evaluation was conducted in two overlapping phases. Evaluation questions in phase one aimed to determine whether the gaining of teaching experience was a need for BA students in SLS. Evaluation questions in phase two then focused on how the department could support students to gain teaching experience, should there be a need. Findings from the two phases are presented separately, and where appropriate, are organized by evaluation question following a report of survey respondent demographics.

Survey Respondents

Separate surveys were sent by the BA Program Director to 54 undergraduate students with declared majors in SLS, 22 former IS/SLS students, and 16 faculty members. Following an initially low response rate from students to the web-based survey, paper surveys were distributed to students in three SLS undergraduate classrooms. The classrooms were selected based on the probability of reaching students with declared majors in SLS. With the distribution of the paper surveys, a total of 39 students completed either a web-based or paper survey. Of these, four respondents did not finish the survey and were dropped from the analysis leaving a remainder of 35 student respondents (of 54), a 65% response rate. A total of 13 faculty members (of 16 polled) responded to the survey, an 81% response rate.

Due to challenges in raising the response rates of former (matriculated) IS/SLS students, including accessibility and respondent interest, this participant group was dropped from the

evaluation. The decision was made in consultation with PIUs who agreed that because the BA degree in SLS was developed as a new and unique program, input from former IS/SLS students may not adequately represent the perceptions of current and future SLS undergraduates.

Table 1

Profile of Student Survey Respondents.

Demographic	Frequency (<i>n</i> = 35)	%
Semesters of study		
9 +	13	37%
7 to 8	9	26%
5 to 6	7	20%
3 to 4	3	8.5%
1 to 2	3	8.5%
Total	35	100%
Declared major prior to Fall 2011		
Other	19	54%
Interdisciplinary Studies	9	26%
Second Language Studies	7	20%
Total	35	100%
Future plans		
Language teacher	21	60%
Not sure	5	14%
Graduate School - non SLS	4	11%
Graduate School – SLS	3	9%
Other	2	6%
Total	35	100%

Table 1 reports the profile of student respondents. Most student respondents (63%) had completed four or more years of study at an institution of higher learning. Also, prior to the 2011-2012 academic year, most student respondents (54%) had either not yet declared their major or had declared a major other than IS/SLS (26%) or SLS (20%). A majority of student respondents (60%) intended to pursue careers as teachers after completing their degree in SLS, though the survey did not capture whether students planned to teach in the U.S. or overseas.

Others intended to pursue graduate school in SLS (9%) or another field (11%), were not yet sure (14%), or were looking into something else (6%).

Table 2
Profile of Faculty Survey Respondents

Demographic	Frequency (n = 13)	%
Position		
Doctoral student	7	54%
Tenured/non-tenured faculty	4	31%
Other	2	15%
Total	13	100%
BA Committee Member		
Yes	5	38%
No	8	62%
Total	13	100%

Table 2 reports the profile of faculty respondents. Respondents included SLS doctoral students (54%), in addition to tenured/non-tenured faculty (31%), and “other” (15%) who self-identified on the survey as “student adviser” and “recent PhD graduate”. This was representative of the BA instructor and support population at the time of the evaluation. In addition, over 1/3 of faculty respondents (39%) also identified as BA Committee members, the decision making body of the program.

EQ1: To What Extent Does Gaining Teaching Experience Fit Within Program Goals, SLOs, and Existing Course Syllabi of the BA Program in SLS?

This evaluation question was approached primarily through a document analysis. As the program was quite new, there was a limited selection of program documents available to review. However, an analysis was conducted on the BA program proposal, the BA program description, goals, program-level SLOs, and course syllabi. The analysis consisted of combing the documents for references to teaching experience or related activities. Though “professional” appears frequently in existing program documents, there is limited explicit reference to teaching or gaining teaching experience within program level mission, goals, or SLOs. The only explicit reference to the gaining of teaching experience on the programmatic level is found in the program proposal:

“The mission of the Bachelor of Arts degree program in Second Language Studies is to provide students with a comprehensive understanding of scholarship and application in the learning and use of second languages. The program addresses theory, research, *and practice in* acquisition, utilization, and *teaching* of additional languages...” (Department of Second Language Studies, 2011, p. 3, emphasis added)

At the time of the evaluation, the mission statement from the BA proposal was in a clearance process to be posted on the SLS website for the BA program. However, it was not yet available to students or faculty not originally involved with the proposal. In addition to the explicit reference to teaching in the program mission statement, implicit reference to the gaining of teaching experience was found in the 8th and 9th program-level SLOs listed below:

8. *be able to prepare minority language students to acquire the academic literacies* that would allow them to succeed in educational institutions; and
9. *improve the quality of teaching* and learning of second, foreign, and heritage languages, in the state of Hawai‘i, domestically, and abroad. (http://www.hawaii.edu/sls/sls/?page_id=101, emphasis added).

Table 3

Teaching Reference within SLS Course Syllabi

Course Title and Number	Teaching in SLOs	Teaching in Course Requirements
Second Language (L2) Learning		
SLS 302(1)	--	--
SLS 302(2)	--	--
SLS 302(3)	--	--
Second Language Teaching		
SLS 303(1)	X	X
SLS 303(3)	X	X
Techniques in L2 Teaching Reading & Writing		
SLS 312	X	X
Bilingual Education		
SLS 380	--	--
Instructional Media		
SLS 418	X	--
Pidgin & Creole English in Hawai'i		
SLS 430	--	--
Language Concepts in L2 Learning & Teaching		
SLS 441(1)	--	--
SLS 441(2)	--	--
English Phonology		
SLS 460	X	X
Introduction to Sociolinguistics in L2 Research		
SLS 480U	--	--
Professionalism in SLS		
SLS 480P	--	--

At the course level, 15 course syllabi were received from the Program Director. The course-level SLOs and course requirements were reviewed for reference to “teaching”. Results are shown in Table 3. Five syllabi contained references to teaching within course SLOs and examples included, “demonstrate teaching skill necessary for future work” and “cover issues and techniques for teaching pronunciation”. Four syllabi also referenced teaching, specifically microteaching, within course requirements. Though a handful of course syllabi referenced

“teaching” in SLOs and/or course requirements, the gaining of authentic teaching experience was only included in SLS-460: English Phonology, which required students to tutor English language learners outside of their class. Authentic teaching experience is defined here as the act of teaching to a student or students. This is different from microteaching which can be defined as the act of teaching to your classroom peers. This distinction is further discussed in the focus group findings under EQ3.

EQ2 To What Extent Do Students and Faculty Believe Gaining Teaching Experience Is Necessary for SLS BA Students?

In addition to the document analysis, questions on the survey asked faculty if they believed gaining teaching experience was a component of program goals and SLOs and if it was included in their existing course syllabi. Results are reported in Table 4. Most faculty respondents (69%) agreed or strongly agreed that gaining teaching experience is a component of BA program goals and SLOs, though a number of respondents (23%) remained neutral, and a small handful (8%) disagreed with the statement. In line with this pattern, seven faculty respondents (54%) indicated that gaining teaching experience is, or has been, a component of their SLS BA course syllabi. This was a slightly higher percentage than expected following the document analysis. However, six respondents described the activities which included very different concepts of teaching experience such as; “students do projects on teaching units”, “microteaching”; and “construct teaching portfolio”. The different articulations of teaching experience captured on the survey spurred later use of the Delphi technique to develop a common conception of teaching experience for BA students.

To capture students’ perceptions of professional development in the program, a survey question asked students if they believe they will be sufficiently prepared for professional work in the SLS field after graduation. Findings from this question are also reported in Table 4. A slight minority of student respondents (43%) agreed or strongly agreed they would be sufficiently prepared for professional work after graduation. However, the majority of respondents reported feeling neutral (31%), disagreed or strongly disagreed (26%) with this statement. In explanation of their responses, ten (42%) reported needing more teaching experience, six (25%) stated they would be prepared, three (17%) reported they weren’t certain and three (17%) listed other

explanations. These findings should be taken with a grain of salt as the program is new and it may be too soon to gauge students' sense of the curriculum. However, findings suggest that some students perceived they will not be sufficiently prepared for professional work after graduation and a lack of teaching experience was a prominent explanation for these perceptions.

Table 4

Student and Faculty Perceptions of Teaching Experience within the BA program

Item	Respondent	<i>M</i>	Mode	<i>SD</i>	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Teaching experience is a component of SLS BA program goals and SLOs.	Faculty <i>n</i> = 13	3.8	4	0.8	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	7 (54%)	2 (15%)
I will be sufficiently prepared for work in the SLS field upon graduation.	Student <i>n</i> = 35	3.2	4	1.1	3 (9%)	6 (17%)	11 (31%)	12 (34%)	3 (9%)
It is necessary for students to gain teaching experience while pursuing a BA in SLS.	Faculty <i>n</i> = 13	4.2	4	0.9	0 (0%)	1 (8%)	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	5 (39%)
	Student <i>n</i> = 35	4.3	5	1.0	1 (3%)	1 (3%)	4 (11%)	9 (26%)	20 (57%)

In the evaluation surveys, both students and faculty were asked the extent to which they agreed gaining teaching experience is necessary for SLS BA students. Results are also reported in Table 4. Over 80% of student (83%) and faculty (85%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that gaining teaching experience is necessary for students while completing the BA program, though a greater number of student respondents (57%) than faculty (39%) strongly agreed with the statement. This finding suggests that though a hearty majority of both students and faculty agree gaining teaching experience is a need, students aligned more strongly with the statement.

A majority of survey respondents provided explanations for their responses to this question, which were coded and reviewed for common themes as presented in Table 5. Most student comments (77%) were in support of gaining teaching experience, and common themes included gaining experience in order to learn (33%), for future employment (22%), and that practice or experience teaching was important for students (22%). Themes found within the faculty

comments that were supportive of gaining teaching experience were similar to students, including experience is needed for learning (30%), and gaining teaching practice or experience is simply a need for students (10%).

Despite the finding that 85% of faculty agreed with the need for teaching experience, a slight majority of faculty open-ended comments (60%) maintained that the gaining of teaching experience was not a universal need for every student. The most common theme was that the need to gain experience depended on the motivation and future goals of individual students (30%). This topic was also the most common theme among student comments not supporting the need for students to gain teaching experience.

Table 5
Student and Faculty Survey Comments: “Gaining Teaching Experience is Necessary”

	Themes	Frequency	%
Students (n = 27)	Gaining teaching experience is necessary		
	Learning	9	33%
	Future employment	6	22%
	Practice or experience is a need	6	22%
	Gaining experience may NOT be necessary		
	Depends on students' time, motivation and interest	3	11%
	U.S. is different from overseas	1	4%
	SLS already helps students gain experience	1	4%
	Unrelated	1	4%
	Total	27	100%
Faculty (n = 13)	Gaining teaching experience is necessary		
	Learning	3	30%
	Practice or experience is needed	1	10%
	Gaining experience may NOT be necessary		
	Depends on the students' motivation and goals	3	30%
	Shouldn't be required	1	10%
	Not a part of the program	1	10%
	Already a part of the program	1	10%
Total	13	100%	

These comments are not exhaustive, but they do demonstrate that students have different motivations for gaining experience and some students may not want or need to gain teaching

experience within the program. This finding was further supported in comments within focus groups conducted in phase two of the evaluation reported under EQ3.

Findings from the document analysis and surveys in phase one of the evaluation clearly supported the potential need for students to gain teaching experience within the BA program. This triggered further investigation of how to potentially meet this need in phase two of the evaluation.

EVALUATION FINDINGS PHASE TWO

EQ3 What Constitutes A Meaningful Teaching Experience for SLS BA Students?

Findings from surveys conducted in phase one of the evaluation indicated that BA faculty held diverse ideas about what constituted a teaching experience. Clarification of teaching experience was addressed as a first step in phase two of the evaluation through use of a Delphi technique process, followed by focus groups, each of which will be reported in turn.

Delphi technique. The Delphi Technique was employed in the evaluation to address different conceptions of teaching experience that appeared in comments on the faculty survey. The aim was to develop a common definition of teaching experience, specifically for BA students in SLS. Eleven faculty members elected to participate in the process; two dropped out after the first round for a total of nine participants (56%) including two tenured faculty, two BA advisers, and five doctoral students.

To begin, the following two questions were asked of participating faculty via email: (a) what do you believe is the definition of a teaching experience, particularly in regards to the SLS BA program, and (b) what do you believe are the characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience, particularly in regards to SLS BA students? Delphi participants submitted responses and then completed two subsequent rounds of ranking and re-ranking the groups' anonymous responses. Snapshots of the top-ranked definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience are presented in Table 6. Full definitions are included in Appendix 5.

It is important to emphasize that Table 6 only includes portions of definitions of teaching experience that emerged from the Delphi technique process. At the conclusion of the Delphi exercise, four definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience were ranked higher (*M*

= 4.0 to 5.0) than others by faculty participants. The higher ranked definitions of “teaching experience” ($M = 4.4$) included descriptions of teaching as an activity that involved various elements such as lesson planning and delivering teaching. Also, a common element within the higher ranked definitions of a “meaningful teaching experience” ($M = 4.3$) included learning from other teachers. A combination of various elements, for example, lesson planning, instruction, reflection, etc. were included in all four of the higher ranked descriptions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience.

Though most faculty participants (8 of 9, 89%) agreed or strongly agreed with the top four ranked definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience, a majority (6/7 of 9, 67% to 78%) also agreed or strongly agreed with other definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience, many of which contained similar elements as the higher ranked definitions. Due to participants’ high level of agreement ($M = 3.5$ to 5.0) with many (11 of 18, 61%) of the different definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience, the definitions were broken down into verb phrases and noun phrases in order to identify common elements within different definitions. These were then grouped by language choice and conceptual similarity (i.e. “*conceive* educational experience” with “*plan* educational experience”).

The frequency of particular noun phrases and verb phrases was calculated and categories such as “reflection” and “lesson planning” were attached to the groupings. Noun and verb phrases that received mean rankings between 4.0 and 5.0 were analyzed separately from items with mean rankings between 3.0 and 4.0. This step was taken after higher ranked items were found to be shadowed by lower-ranked items when grouped together. The analysis and results were checked for agreement with program administrators, and the results are reported in Table 7. Following the Delphi technique and analysis of the findings, a list of elements that frequently appeared within higher-ranked definitions of teaching and meaningful teaching experience emerged. This list was then revisited with faculty in focus groups.

Focus groups. The focus groups consisted of both individuals who had and had not participated in the Delphi technique process. This allowed the focus groups to act as a check on findings with insider participants and with stakeholders who had no involvement in previous discussions about teaching experience for BA students.

In order to check the results of the Delphi technique and subsequent language analysis, focus group participants were presented with a list of the categories in Table 7, not including unrepeated phrases. The categories, or elements, appeared in alphabetical order, and repeated items were only listed once. Each participant was asked to circle three or four of the items they believed were most important for BA students to have a meaningful teaching experience and then discuss their choices.

Each participant in the focus groups had an opportunity to discuss which elements they felt were most important for BA students in a teaching experience. The majority view of PhD group participants identified classroom observation, lesson planning, act of teaching, microteaching, materials development, reflection, and feedback as important elements in a meaningful teaching experience. Classroom observation and lesson planning were the most repeated elements in the discussion, and in explanation of their choices, most participants reflected on their own experience learning how to teach. For example, one participant commented, “I was a little confused before we started because we’re talking about the kind of experience that is needed by the students in our BA program and I was thinking of my own experience, when I first had to teach.” There was no noteworthy disagreement between PhD participants in this section of the focus group.

Participants in the Advisor group discussed the act of teaching, getting feedback, lesson planning, and reflection as important elements for BA students to have in a teaching experience. Materials development was also selected though this was later amended to instructional design (e.g., curriculum development). Unlike the PhD group, there was less repetition and overlap between participants’ discussion of elements in the Advisor group. Thus, though the elements presented by participants in the Advisor group aligned with those presented in the PhD group, they did not necessarily reflect internal group consensus. However, it is noteworthy that Advisor group participants did not disagree with any elements presented during the discussion. Instead, participants segued off topic into a discussion about program goals. This observation is further addressed in the “Discussion” section.

Table 6

Snapshots of Top Ranked (M = 4.0-5.0) Definitions of "Teaching" and "Meaningful Teaching Experience" in Rank Order.

Item	<i>M</i>	MD	<i>SD</i>	Strongly Disagree (left) to Strongly Agree (right)				
Teaching Experience								
Activity or event organized by a teacher to result in some kind of learning experience...	4.4	5	1.33	1	0	0	1	7
Activities that involve lesson planning, material development...	4.4	5	0.73	0	0	1	3	5
A teaching experience is something that you gain by actually undergoing some sort of teaching practice	3.8	4	1.2	1	0	1	5	2
Teaching a group of real students in a real class with the assistance and an experienced teacher	3.7	5	1.41	1	1	1	3	3
The opportunity to experience teaching first hand	3.7	2	1.32	0	3	0	3	3
A teaching experience involves working with one or more students to help them learn content or develop ability	3.1	3	1.05	0	3	3	2	1
The student has an opportunity to design a lesson plan	2.9	3	0.93	1	1	5	2	0
Any kinds of L2 tutoring and classroom	2.9	3	1.36	1	3	3	0	2
A teaching experience includes planning effective lesson plans to create meaningful opportunities for students	2.8	3	0.97	0	4	4	0	1
Meaningful Teaching Experience								
Preparing an appropriate lesson plan with a teacher or teacher trainer...	4.3	5	1	0	1	0	3	5
The experience of observing, planning lessons and teaching, needs to be with meaningful reflection	4.3	5	1	0	1	0	3	5
Planning, execution of a lesson plan, evaluation of some sort, and reflection for future improvement.	4.1	5	0.93	0	0	3	2	4
Gain the basic linguistic concepts and learn about various teaching techniques/methods	3.8	4	1.48	1	1	1	2	4
Work inside and outside the classroom, assisting individual students and groups	3.7	4	0.87	0	1	2	5	1
As much realia as possible (e.g., real students, real situations...or mock-teaching performances)	3.6	4	1.24	1	0	3	3	2
Some (or all) of the following: assessing the students' abilities and needs...	3.3	4	1.41	1	2	1	3	2
Setting up clear SLOs both for long-term (for entire course) and for short-term (for each sessions/classes),	3.2	3	1.3	1	1	4	1	2
Effective lesson plans, understandings of students' second/foreign language learning experience	3.1	2	1.05	0	3	3	2	1

Table 7

Results from Analysis of Language Used within Definitions of Teaching and Meaningful Teaching Experience.

Category	Frequency
Mean Rankings 4.0 – 5.0	
Reflection/Feedback	9
Instructor-supported learning	5
Lesson Planning	4
Act of teaching	4
Evaluation	3
Micro-teaching	3
Amount of teaching experience	2
Materials development	2
Unrepeated Phrases	
Specific teaching acts	12
Other	12
Mean Rankings 3.0 – 4.0	
Act of teaching	11
Lesson Planning	7
Micro-teaching	7
Classroom Observation	5
Instructor-supported learning	4
Reflection/Feedback	4
Student-teacher learning	4
Materials development	2
Practicum	2
Private tutoring	2
Volunteer teaching	2
Unrepeated Phrases	
Specific teaching acts	6
Other	17

Participants in both groups were also asked if there was anything missing from the list or anything that they would remove from it. Apprenticeship and peer-support were brought up as potentially missing items in the PhD group and were supported by a majority of participants. Apprenticeship was discussed as “a kind of apprentice or assistant to a teacher who is actually

teaching the class.” Peer support was presented as a mentorship model, as in “BA students can have a workshop with more experienced teachers in the MA or PhD program and then exchange information.” This suggestion was also supported by a comment in the BA group interview: “...we can get together and discuss our experiences or give each other more resources. I think that would be more helpful in our program”.

Along a different line, the majority of participants in the Advisor group discussed, and agreed, that there was a need to include non-teaching professional experience as a missing element for BA students; for example, observation of non-teaching language professions. As one Advisor participant stated, “...for somebody who’s maybe not interested in teaching but interested in becoming something like a court interpreter, observation of that makes more sense than observing a class.” There was a consensus throughout the entire Advisor focus group discussion that the Department should equally support BA students who may not be interested in teaching. The sentiment was captured in one participant comment, which suggested “...so many things are a part of second language studies in addition to teaching.” Though discussion in the PhD focus group did not support this finding, a comment in the BA student group interview did support the idea that not all students want to teach: “They may not necessarily have any intention to teach, they’re just getting a BA to then go further on in their academic career and do something else.”

No participants in the PhD group wanted to remove items from the list of teaching elements, but a few felt that some items should be clarified. For example, one participant stated, “I can see some redundancy, like act of teaching. Like microteaching, practicum, private tutoring, and act of teaching.” This spurred a discussion about microteaching that resulted in the majority of PhD group participants agreeing that microteaching is a form of teaching, though different from teaching outside of the classroom. A similar discussion occurred in the Advisor group where the majority view also defined microteaching as a type of teaching, though an inauthentic form. This was best captured in the following exchange between two Advisor group participants attempting to define microteaching: “Small-scale simulations of teaching within a classroom, within your own classroom” ... “Oh, simulations, not with real students, with your peers.”

In contrast with the PhD group, a participant in the Advisor group suggested that materials development, specifically development of new materials, should be removed from the list. As the

participant described it, "...particularly if someone is new and a beginner they shouldn't be expected to write their own materials at the same time they are developing their skills in classroom teaching...suppose the lesson doesn't work, then is it because they are new materials...or is it because...the teacher, you know, screwed up the timing.". The majority of Advisor participants agreed with the argument which was also supported within the BA student group interview: "I kind of lean towards materials development as a BA because I can't really focus on developing materials at this point because I really don't know what my students need."

Though the focus group protocol did not prompt participants to consider the elements as a group, PhD participants independently discussed the elements as overlapping and sequential. For example, the majority of participants agreed that the most important elements of a meaningful teaching experience for BA students should be presented as a system of learning. As one participant observed, "No order of importance, but maybe as a sequence so it would be classroom observation, lesson planning, and microteaching together, with feedback going on within that...". A similar idea was also presented in the Advisor group during a discussion of microteaching in relation to authentic teaching: "If they're first year teachers in the class then this [microteaching] is a good way to practice but they're on the fourth year or something then practicum or other forms of teaching are more suitable". One participant in each group also commented that taken together, the most meaningful elements of a teaching experience (e.g., observation, lesson planning, reflection, feedback, etc.) constitute a teaching practicum. For example, after discussing the importance of these different elements, a PhD participant concluded, "You put them all together and that makes a process, it's called a practicum." Though it was not apparent if a majority of participants in the two focus groups agreed that the elements taken together create a practicum, there was majority agreement in both groups that the most desired elements for a meaningful teaching experience overlap and can be more or less appropriate at certain stages in the learning process.

EQ4 What Support Do Students and Faculty Perceive Students Need from the SLS Department to Gain Teaching Experience Within the BA Program?

This evaluation question was addressed cursorily in the initial surveys of students and faculty

in phase one of the evaluation, and in more depth within follow-up focus groups. Findings from each of these instruments will be discussed separately.

Surveys. Questions on student and faculty surveys initially aimed to capture perceptions of students' capacity to establish and learn from self-directed teaching opportunities in order to inform the level of support that students may need to gain teaching experience within the BA program. To get a sense of whether students had engaged in self-directed teaching, survey questions captured students' previous teaching experiences. Student respondents also commented on the number of hours per week they would commit to gaining teaching experience outside of their regular schedules. This information is captured in Table 8. A majority of student respondents (63%) reported to have currently or previously worked or volunteered in a teaching position. Most of these were reported to be tutoring positions, with the average length of experience 5.1 hours a week for 11.75 months. On average, students estimated an ability to commit to 5.6 hours (*range*, 1 – 20 hours) of teaching experience per week outside of their regular schedules.

Table 8

Students Previous Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	Frequency	%
Previous experience	22	63%
No previous experience	13	37%
Total	35	100%
Language tutor	15	68%
Teacher	3	14%
Language exchange	2	9%
Teacher Assistant	1	4.5%
Other	1	4.5%
Total	22	100%
Average hours/week	5.1	
Average number of months	11.75	

On the surveys, students and faculty were asked to rank their perceptions of students' capacity to establish and learn from self-directed teaching experiences without support. Results

from these questions are reported in Table 9. There was a marked difference between students' and faculty's perceptions of student ability. For example, a slight majority of students (58%) agreed with the statement "I am capable of establishing teaching opportunities without guidance or support". In contrast, a majority of faculty (62%) *disagreed* with this statement. There was a similar difference in agreement with the statement "I am/Students are able to learn from teaching experience without guidance or support." Again, a slight majority of students agreed with this statement while a majority of faculty disagreed (54%). There were high standard deviations (SD) in the responses from both students and faculty in this section of the survey, particularly regarding students' ability to learn from teaching experience without guidance. Due to the small faculty respondent pool, a higher SD is expected. However, the high SD in students' responses (1.16) indicates diversity within students' self-perceptions of their ability to learn without guidance. There was also a high SD (1.03) and a fairly even spread between student agreement (43%) and disagreement (37%) with the statement: "I am able to identify opportunities to gain teaching experience without guidance", also indicating diversity within students' self-perceptions of ability.

The question of preferred departmental support for students was initially addressed in a series of statements within the surveys. Each statement represented a support option for students to gain teaching experience. They were presented on the surveys, in order, from a relatively high level of support and guidance (i.e. practicum) to no support or guidance. Students and faculty respondents were then asked to select their level of agreement with each statement. Results are reported in Table 10 and have been reordered following the highest mean ranking from both students and faculty, to the lowest mean ranking.

Interestingly, there was a fairly high level of agreement between student and faculty rankings. Both students and faculty respondents had the highest agreement with self-directed teaching ($M = 4.26, 4.27$, respectively) followed closely by teaching practicum ($M = 4.21, 4.00$).

Table 9

Student and Faculty Perceptions of Student Ability to Establish and Learn from Teaching Experience

Item	Respondent	M	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Disagree
I am able to identify opportunities to gain teaching or related experience without guidance or support.	Student n = 35	3.03	3	1.03	2 (6%)	11 (31%)	7 (20%)	14 (40%)	1 (3%)
I am comfortable contacting organizations to establish teaching experience without guidance or support.	Student n = 35	3.34	4	0.98	0 (0%)	10 (29%)	6 (17%)	16 (46%)	3 (12%)
Students are capable of learning from a teaching or related experience without guidance or support.	Faculty n = 13	2.77	2	1.17	1 (8%)	7 (54%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)
I feel capable of learning from a teaching or related experience without guidance or support.	Student n = 35	3.09	2	1.16	2 (6%)	12 (34%)	6 (17%)	11 (31%)	4 (11%)
Students are able to establish opportunities to gain teaching or related experience without guidance or support	Faculty n = 13	2.46	2	0.88	1 (8%)	6 (46%)	2 (15%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)

Also interesting, these two options represent very different levels of support for students. For example, self-directed teaching was described as “providing information to students” whereas a practicum was described as “structured guidance and support”.

Table 10

Student and Faculty Agreement with Type of Support the SLS Department Should Provide Students

Item	Student (n=35) Faculty (n=13)	M	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Information to students to identify self-directed volunteer teaching opportunities	Student	4.26	4	0.74	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	17 (49%)	14 (40%)
	Faculty	4.27	4	0.65	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (9%)	6 (55%)	4 (36%)
Structured guidance and support for teaching experience through a teaching practicum.	Student	4.21	5	0.99	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	10 (29%)	17 (49%)
	Faculty	4	5	1.18	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	1 (9%)	3 (27%)	5 (46%)
Unstructured or semi-structured teaching opportunities within courses (i.e. service learning)	Student	3.89	4	0.98	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	7 (20%)	15 (43%)	10 (28%)
	Faculty	3.36	3	1.03	1 (9%)	0 (0%)	5 (46%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)
Teaching opportunities with little guidance through internships.	Student	3.77	4	1.07	0 (0%)	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	11 (31%)	11 (31%)
	Faculty	2.73	3	1.1	1 (9%)	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	1 (9%)	1 (9%)
Encourage students to gain experience but NOT provide further guidance or support	Student	2.29	2	1.02	8 (24%)	13 (38%)	9 (27%)	3 (9%)	1 (3%)
	Faculty	2.18	2	1.08	3 (24%)	5 (46%)	1 (9%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)
Not do anything: Students are responsible for their own learning.	Student	1.71	1	1.02	20 (59%)	7 (21%)	5 (15%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
	Faculty	1.55	1	0.82	7 (64%)	2 (18%)	2 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Both respondent groups also agreed with “unstructured or semi-structured teaching opportunities within courses” ($M = 3.89, 3.36$) as a support option though to a lesser extent than a practicum or self-directed teaching. There was a split between students and faculty in mean ratings for an internship option, though the relative order of the option aligned between groups. Students tended to slightly agree ($M = 3.77$) with an internship option where faculty tended to slightly disagree ($M = 2.73$) with this option. However, both faculty ($M = 2.18$) and student respondents ($M = 2.29$) disagreed with the statement that students should be encouraged to gain experience but not receive support. Additionally, students ($M = 1.71$) and faculty ($M = 1.55$)

strongly disagreed with the statement that the department should do nothing and that students are responsible for their own learning.

Focus groups. It was curious that faculty respondents rated “self-directed volunteer teaching” higher than other support options, considering that a majority of faculty perceived students had low capacity to establish and learn from teaching experiences without support. This discrepancy was addressed as a direct question in the PhD and Advisor focus groups. The groups also discussed different support options for students.

In both focus groups the moderator reported the conflicting survey findings and asked, “Why do you think this is?” An immediate and similar answer by participants in both groups elicited laughter from fellow group participants. For example, a PhD participant asked, “Was that contrast divided by the kind of faculty?”, the punch-line being that supporting students to teach can be a lot of work and would more likely fall on tenured and non-tenured faculty rather than PhD student instructors. A fellow jokester in the Advisor group commented along the same lines, “Preferred by the faculty? Because it involves less work and effort!” Though these were the first responses, they did not ultimately reflect the majority view of the participants in either group. Interestingly, the majority view held by participants in both groups interpreted the conflicting survey findings in terms of an ideal versus reality. For example, one PhD participant commented, “Ideally it would be great if our institution can support everything...but in reality we don’t have any of those resources...so what we’re capable of doing right now is just self-directed.” A participant in the Advisor group made a similar statement, “...unless we get a lot more resources from our Dean to support our program, which may or may not be possible, but I think given the limited resources...I mean, there’s the ideal.” Further findings from this strain of the focus group discussions are reported under EQ5.

In addition to addressing the discrepancy in the survey findings, focus group participants were also asked to discuss different support options for students. The statements of potential SLS Departmental support included in the surveys were placeholders arbitrarily developed by the evaluator in conjunction with program administrators to represent varying levels of possible support, in order to get a general sense of student and faculty preferences. For this reason, these options were revisited during focus groups, and participants were asked to discuss potential alternatives. Participants were provided a list of different support options for BA students that

included: (a) self-directed volunteer teaching, (b) teaching practicum, (c) service-learning: volunteer teaching as a component of a course, and (d) internships.

In both focus groups, participants brainstormed alternative models for the SLS Department to support BA students to gain teaching or related experience. All of the alternatives suggested within the PhD group were different types of private language tutoring. In discussion the group agreed that tutoring should be systematic and supported through relationships with existing language education organizations on campus. As one participant commented, “They [English language students] want opportunities to interact with people outside of their class, and we have so many people in our BA program, and it’s also a good opportunity for them...that connection could be established, it would benefit both institutes.”

In contrast, participants in the Advisor group discussed course-level support such as a practicum or internship, and largely disfavored options for students to gain experience through private tutoring or self-directed volunteer teaching. For example, one participant commented, “Private tutoring...doesn’t involve manifesting the conventional role of the teacher in a conventional setting.” However, this view was countered with the argument that private tutoring was better than nothing.

The bulk of the discussion within the Advisor group consisted of the co-construction of a joint practicum/internship course as an alternative option to support students in gaining teaching or other professional experience. The unique feature of this option included supporting teaching and non-teaching interests within a single course. This was proposed as a less-than-ideal alternative to a situation where students interested in teaching take a practicum and others take independent study courses with instructors who do not receive compensation. As one Advisor participant summarized the solution, “So you’d be in favor of sticking them [non-teaching students] in with the teaching people.” However, as the discussion progressed, the group shifted views to see the joining of teaching and non-teaching students in a single course as a benefit for students. For example, one participant commented, “...the more we talk more I think this is valuable because many of them might come into this thinking teaching is the only thing you can do and then maybe that other person is doing something...sounds more exciting so it might open up.”

In the co-construction of a potential practicum/internship alternative course, Advisor participants came to consensus that such a course should require students, with support, to individually establish practicum or internship positions prior to the course, potentially through an additional one-credit course. As one participant succinctly captured the idea, “The instructor would then...they would sign off, in order to enroll they would have to find their own job essentially with, potentially fairly minimal support on the department’s side. Then they can enroll in this course and they meet for whatever support, feedback”.

The majority of participants in the Advisor group agreed that students would gain valuable experience if they were supported to self-identify professional opportunities. Also, the structure would ensure students had choice. One participant shared a comment capturing the benefit of giving students choice that received support within the Advisor group: “I switched to that approach after the first one or two semesters of the other...after a couple of cases, somebody comes back after the first week, ‘Oh , I don’t want to go all the way downtown... I thought Ms. so and so, that’s not the kind of teacher I want to be.”

The two BA student participants in the group interview were explicitly asked what support they felt they needed from the Department. Though their responses may not be representative, both participants agreed they needed information about potential organizations they could contact for positions and they needed to know expectations for the teaching experience. As one of the students commented, “I know it says self-directed but, so there’s some direction for the self-direction.” A similar idea was also proposed in the Advisor group, though in terms of assisting students in the finding of positions, “...the course instructor could even provide a page they could give to these people...I intend to take 4XX in SLS, it requires me to do this and that, and I’d love to do that in your institution.”

EQ5 What Are Possible Constraints or Limitations to Supporting the Most Viable Options for Students to Gain Teaching Experience?

Potential limitations and constraints on the development of departmental support for students to gain teaching experience were explored exclusively within focus group discussions. Participants in the focus groups were asked to discuss which forms of support for students were perceived to be easier or harder to implement. Participants in both focus groups initially

acknowledged that self-directed volunteer teaching and private tutoring would be easiest to implement. However, the majority view in both groups did not embrace options that were considered easier to implement. For example, a participant in the PhD group questioned, “Is ‘easier to implement’ the criteria we should be using? ...we’ve already said the students need structure and support.” The majority view in the Advisor group was that it was the responsibility of the department to provide support to students. As one participant stated, “I’m not happy with the self-directed stuff. On the contrary, I feel it’s an abdication of responsibility.”

There was consensus both within and between focus groups in discussion of support options that would be more difficult to implement. The majority view of the PhD group agreed that anything involving systematic support or coordination with outside organizations would be challenging to implement. One participant captured it as, “...we’d be sort of doing it from the ground up...it’s quite resource heavy. To come up with this program takes a lot of resources, time which isn’t really available.” A similar view was also proposed in the Advisor group, “...there’s going to have to be a lot of individual negotiation. This is not something that they [contacts in outside organizations] normally do at all...and so it’s not, it’s not going to be easy.”

Another strand of consensus within and between groups was the need for additional administrative support in order to implement programs for students to gain teaching experience. Interestingly, individual participants in both of the focus groups suggested the need to clone the Program Director, both mentioning him by name. These ideas were summarized clearly in a PhD participant comment, “It has to be a separate coordinator that’s in charge of it...somebody in the department that’s holding all that together.”

An additional consideration for implementation was brought up in the PhD focus group that was then supported by other PhD group members. One participant in the PhD group discussed the need for behavior codes. In agreement another participant commented, “Yeah...if you go to different departments...they have really strict behavior codes and if you break it, you get failed.” However, participants in the Advisor group did not bring up a need to develop behavior codes for BA students. The focus group moderator then asked the Advisor group to respond to potential problems in the behavior of BA students. The majority view of the group did not consider the behavior of BA students to be a serious concern. This idea was well captured in one Advisor

participant comment, “That’s pretty unusual, I mean, I haven’t had many problems. Suppose we might be a few more problems because we’re dealing with younger people.”

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The primary use of the first phase of the evaluation was to inform a decision regarding whether students should gain teaching experience while completing the BA program. This goal was initially approached by collecting data through a document analysis and surveying students and faculty. Though the document analysis was somewhat limited due to the newness of the program, findings indicated that the gaining of teaching experience was present, but not explicit, in most program literature. Teaching experience was explicit in the mission statement of the BA proposal; however, this document was not available to a majority of program stakeholders at the time of the evaluation. Because most program stakeholders did not have access to the BA program mission, it is possible that the place of teaching within the goals of the BA program was, and continues to be, somewhat ambiguous.

Faculty responses to the survey indicated that a majority perceive teaching experience is a component of BA program goals and SLOs, and some faculty reported including activities for students to gain teaching experience in their courses. Though faculty largely considered teaching experience a component of the program, comments about teaching experiences included within existing course syllabi indicated different ideas about what constitutes a teaching experience. Also, just over half of student respondents were neutral, or disagreed, that they would be sufficiently prepared for a career in the SLS field after graduation, with the largest number citing a lack of teaching experience as the reason. There may be many factors contributing to this finding, including the fact that the survey was distributed very early in the program’s first semester. However, students’ feelings of preparedness partially linked to a lack of teaching experience in the program contrast with faculty perceptions that teaching is a component of the program. One potential reason for the gap may be different conceptions of teaching experience between students and faculty. For example, all survey comments capturing students’ previous teaching experience referenced out-of-class authentic teaching experiences, largely tutoring. In contrast, faculty comments reporting teaching experience within existing courses included

various in-class activities and only one authentic out-of-class teaching experience, also tutoring. This finding suggests that faculty and students may have different expectations for teaching experience and much of it may have to do with where the teaching takes place.

Different conceptions of teaching experience were fleshed out through the use of the Delphi technique and focus group discussions. Findings implied that there are key elements, or components, of a teaching experience which should be included in a program developed for BA students, and these included: (a) classroom observation, (b) lesson planning, (c) microteaching, (d) feedback, (e) reflection, and (f) an authentic act of teaching. Findings also indicated that peer-support may be beneficial to students gaining experience and that materials development should be left to more advanced levels of learning. Additionally, findings from focus group discussions suggested that these key elements of teaching may be most meaningful in a sequence of learning and, taken together, they may resemble a teaching practicum.

The most salient finding for initial evaluation use came from the surveys, which indicated that over 80% of both students and faculty agreed BA students need to gain teaching experience as a component of the new program. 65% of students and 81% of faculty participated in the survey, indicating these findings were relatively representative of the populations involved. While surveys revealed that students and faculty believed it is necessary for BA students to gain teaching experience, comments suggested that this is not a universal need and gaining experience may depend on student interest and future career plans. This interpretation was corroborated in focus group discussions. Moreover, though a majority of students intended to be teachers after graduation, over one third of students were not sure of their plans or were not interested in teaching. This pattern implies that any efforts to incorporate teaching experience into the BA program may need to be kept optional and should consider students' individual motivation and interest. This sentiment was captured well in a comment during a follow-up meeting with program administrators, "It's not just about being optional, it's about having options."

The second intended use for the evaluation sought to inform decisions about the type and form of support needed for students to gain teaching experience, first by capturing perceptions of student abilities to teach without support. Students reported mixed self-perceptions of ability while faculty largely felt students did not have a strong capacity to establish and learn from teaching experience without guidance, which suggested students should be provided with

support. Following comments in the BA student group interview and Advisor focus group, a base level of support may include information about organizations and guidance about what is expected of the students. These findings suggest, at a minimum, that the Department should consider providing information about language teaching or related professional organizations to students along with information about what the students are expected to do.

No single option emerged as the most viable or appropriate form of support for students to gain teaching experience. However, the most preferred option on the survey was self-directed volunteer teaching, with teaching practicum a close second. Participants in both the PhD and Advisor focus groups agreed that self-directed volunteer teaching and private tutoring would be the easiest forms of support for the Department to implement. However, both groups also agreed that forms of support that were easy to implement did not necessarily meet the needs of students, and that considerations needed to be made for students who want to gain professional experience but are not interested in teaching. This approach was best represented in the co-construction of a practicum/internship course within the Advisor focus group that could accommodate both teachers and other language professionals.

The PhD focus group promoted institutionalized private tutoring options for BA students to gain teaching experience. In contrast, participants in the Advisor group did not support private tutoring as an ideal support option. However, one of the participants who did not support private tutoring also commented, "...if that's the only thing you can get it'd be better than nothing". There was a strong consensus between participants in both groups that support for students to gain teaching or related experience should be institutionalized and that the support should be managed by an individual or individuals within the Department. However, participants in both focus groups agreed that institutional support required resources that the Department did not currently have. This finding is particularly important considering the unexpectedly high level of student enrollment within the program's first year. These findings implied that in order for the SLS Department to meet the need for interested students to gain teaching or related experience, the Department may need to acquire more resources, specifically manpower, before moving forward.

Limitations of the Study

Every attempt was made to capture information from important program stakeholders at each stage of the evaluation. However, student input was minimal in the second phase of data collection. Though information gathered in the BA student group interview provided insights on findings from the survey and faculty focus groups, the two participants were not representative of the overall student population and findings were used limitedly. For this reason, extra efforts should be made to involve students in the implementation of evaluation recommendations during development of the program. Acknowledging this need, program administrators indicated a plan to include BA student representation within the BA Committee to ensure students have a voice in future program level decisions.

Strengths of the Study

A mixed methods research (MMR) design was employed in the process of the evaluation. MMR can be defined as the use of qualitative and quantitative research approaches, including methods, analysis, etc. for the purpose of greater depth of understanding and corroboration of findings (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie & Turner, 2007, p. 124). Though the use of different data collection instruments arose in order to address ambiguity and questions at different stages of the project, the added benefit of employing mixed methods allowed for triangulation of findings across data and a deeper understanding of what the findings meant. A prime example of this was in the exploration of teaching experience for BA students. Initially, survey findings indicated that BA instructors had different conceptions of teaching experience. The Delphi technique then helped to generate consensus around teaching experience and defined key elements of a meaningful teaching experience which were later corroborated in focus groups. Focus group findings also expanded the results of the Delphi technique to include how components of a meaningful teaching experience could fit together.

The synthesis of quantitative data from surveys and qualitative data from focus groups was crucial to gaining a genuine understanding of student needs and how the Department could best support students. For example, providing information to students in order for them to gain teaching experience through self-directed teaching was the highest ranked option for Departmental support on the surveys. However, this finding was not corroborated in focus

groups and self-directed teaching was found to be selected due to concerns about student choice and Department resources rather than an actual preference for the option. Moreover, focus group findings suggested that students needed, and the Department should provide, a higher degree of support. Had findings been restricted to those in the surveys and not further explored in focus groups, an incomplete and less accurate picture of students' needs would have driven program development.

Professional Identity

The primary use of the evaluation was to inform program development. However, an unintended finding during the project indicated there may be lingering questions and differing concepts about the overall goal of the BA degree among program stakeholders. Ambiguity within program goals appeared in the document analysis and fully emerged during discussions within focus groups. More than one participant in the Advisor focus group proposed questions to the group at large seeking to clarify the larger goals of the BA program. For example, one participant asked, "But, I also want to know, the primary goal of our program, what is it?" The focus group moderator encouraged a response to this question and one participant remarked, "You want to go back to the BA proposal." Another participant agreed with this response though specifics of the proposal could not be recalled by group members. This finding suggested that there are defined goals for the program outlined in the BA proposal that may not be fully known or accessible to all program stakeholders.

The professional identity of BA students also emerged as a point of discussion in both focus groups though it was not included in the focus group protocol. In the Advisor focus group, two participants argued about whether the BA degree was a professional degree. For example, one participant claimed, "...it's an undergraduate degree, it's not a professional training degree." In contrast to this argument, participants in the PhD focus group discussed, at length, the BA program in relation to teacher certification. One comment captured the core of the conversation, "I really want the students to get their certification from getting a BA in TESOL plus an education certification...so they can take it overseas or they can stay here...and teach in public schools."

These two very different strands in the focus group discussions serve to highlight variable perceptions of professional identity within the BA program. Following Wright's (2010) review of transition within the SLTE field, the position of teacher development and students' professional identity appeared to be a core question for the BA program in SLS. Through the evaluation process, program administrators were able to identify this question as a potentially critical issue of program identity and put themselves in a position to address it early on in program development.

CONCLUSION

The evaluation of the need for teaching experience within the BA program in SLS was presented as a model of evaluation in practice. By employing a UFE design, program administrators, the primary intended users of the evaluation, were involved in decision making at all levels of the evaluation including stakeholder analysis, articulation of program use, development of evaluation questions, selection of data collection, implementation, discussion of analysis and findings, and reporting. The active involvement of program administrators was integral to achieving the involvement and interest of other stakeholders, including time-pressed faculty, students, and staff. Following an iterative UFE evaluation process involving multiple stakeholders, analysis of findings and discussion with program administrators, the following suggestions for program development were defined:

1. SLS BA students should be provided institutional support to gain teaching experience while completing the degree.
2. Recognizing that not all students intend to be teachers, gaining teaching or related experience should be kept optional.
3. Meaningful teaching experience opportunities for BA students should aim to include classroom observation, lesson planning, microteaching, reflection, feedback, and authentic teaching.
4. Information provided to students should consider these elements when defining expectations for the teaching experience.

5. Students may need varying levels of support to gain teaching experience, depending on the individual student, and this support should be institutional and systematized.
6. Though self-directed teaching and private tutoring are the easiest ways for students to gain teaching experience and may be explored as alternative options, a more conventional and supported teaching experience in the form of a practicum or internship may be more valuable for learning.
7. Support from the department should attempt to accommodate nonteaching professional experience through professional shadowing, directed reading, and/or inclusion within a practicum or internship course.
8. If a practicum or internship course is pursued, students should be given information and direction to self-identify their own teaching or related professional positions prior to the course.
9. Resources for a dedicated faculty member or administrator to manage institutional support for students should be solicited before developing any additional program.
10. If resources for program development are not available, the SLS Department should pursue a minimum level of support by providing resources to students for help in identifying local opportunities in language teaching and related professions, and direction on what should be gained in the teaching or related experience.

Lingering questions about program goals and differing perceptions of professional identity within the degree indicated there was a potential information gap between the established mission and goals of the program and stakeholders. Following this finding, an additional recommendation for program development was included:

11. Program administrators should ensure that program stakeholders, including tenured and non-tenured faculty and staff, PhD student instructors, members of the BA committee, BA students, and the greater SLS community, have a clear understanding of the BA program mission and goals as articulated in the BA proposal.

At the time of the evaluation, steps were already in place to move in this direction by posting the BA mission statement on the SLS website. In addition, a plan was established, in conjunction with evaluation reporting, to develop a “frequently asked questions” guide for

distribution to program stakeholders. The aim of this guide was both to provide feedback on the results of the evaluation, clarify program goals, and set expectations moving forward.

The intention of the present evaluation was not to explore stakeholders' understandings of program goals or opinions about the professional identity of the program. The fact that these issues emerged during the course of the project likely reflect a larger trend within SLTE resulting from the shifting position of learning to teach as a core curricular competency. This is not to say that all programs are moving in this direction. In fact, though the BA program in SLS does include teaching, the core mission of the program is to develop students "with a comprehensive understanding of scholarship and application in the learning and use of second languages."

The evaluation process both exposed questions about program goals and professional identity and informed primary intended users about the different perceptions held by various stakeholders. The process also created multiple platforms for program stakeholders to exchange ideas and discuss key elements of the program. The end result was a greater understanding of the core competencies of the program, how they fit with stakeholder expectations, and a plan to move forward drawing from established program goals.

Following this model, a UFE approach to evaluation--with the primary intended use to make decisions about the future direction of an SLTE program--may be a viable avenue for program understanding and self-exploration during this time of transition in the SLTE field. Additionally, there is a dearth of published evaluations in SLTE literature and far more research and dissemination is needed in this area in order to better understand professional identity within SLTE programs and to promote continued improvement and innovation in the field.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. John Norris and Dr. JD Brown for their valuable advice and guidance throughout this project. In addition, I want to thank my colleagues Veronika Timpe and Valerie Meier who provided a sounding board and extra pairs of eyes during focus group sessions.

This project would not have been possible without the involvement of faculty, students, and staff involved in the BA program in Second Language Studies. Their input and time that was

given to this project allowed it to succeed. Finally, I would like to thank Kenton Harsch and Priscilla Faucette for their support, time, and dedication to this project. Without strong leadership, meaningful program development is not possible.

REFERENCES

- Bartels, N. (2004). Comments on Robert Yates and Dennis Muchisky's "On reconceptualizing teacher education". Another reader reacts...linguistic imperialism. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 128-133. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588262>
- Beretta, A. (1992). Evaluation of language education: An overview. In J. C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 15–24). Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Brown, J. D. (1995). *The elements of language curriculum: A systematic approach to program development*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Department of Second Language Studies. (2011). *Second language studies Bachelor of Arts proposal*. University of Hawai'i, Honolulu, HI.
- Elder, C. (2008). Reconciling accountability and development needs in heritage language education: A communication challenge for the evaluation consultant. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(4), 477-495. Retrieved from <http://ltr.sagepub.com/>
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (2004). Comments on Robert Yates and Dennis Muchisky's "On reconceptualizing teacher education". Readers react...Common misconceptions about the quiet revolution. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 119-127. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588261>
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397-417. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588114>
- Graves, K. (2009). The curriculum of second language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 115-134). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed method research. *Journal of Mixed Method Research*, 1(2), 112-133. doi: 10.1177/1558689806298224
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Kiely, R., & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program evaluation in language education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Krueger, R. A., & Casey, M. A. (2000). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Muchisky, D. & Yates, R. (2004). Comments on Robert Yates and Dennis Muchisky's "On reconceptualizing teacher education". The authors respond...Defending the discipline, field, and profession. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38(1), 134-140. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588263>
- Norris, J. M. (2006). The why (& how) of assessing student learning outcomes in college foreign language programs. *Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 576–583. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4127045>
- Norris, J. M. (2009). Understanding and improving language education through program evaluation: Introduction to the special issue. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1), 7-13. Retrieved from <http://ltr.sagepub.com/>
- Norris, J. M., Davis, J. McE., Sinicrope, C., & Watanabe, Y. (2009). *Toward useful program evaluation in college foreign language education*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Patton, M. Q. (1997). *Utilization-focused evaluation: The new century text* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278. doi:10.1177/1362168809104698
- Robinson, B. (2003). Evaluation, research and quality. In Robinson, B. & Latchem, C. (Eds.), *Teacher education through open and distance learning* (pp. 193–211). London: Routledge.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology*, 13(1), 3-21. Retrieved from <http://www.springer.com/social+sciences/journal/11133>
- Turnoff, M., & Linstone, H. (2002). *The Delphi Method: Techniques and applications* [online version]. Retrieved from <http://is.njit.edu/pubs/delphibook/>

- Wright, T. (2010). Second language teacher education: Review of recent research on practice. *Language Teaching*, 43(3), 259-296. doi: 10.1017/S0261444810000030
- Yang, W. W. (2009). Evaluation of teacher induction practices in a US university English language program: Towards useful evaluation. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(1), 77-98. Retrieved from <http://ltr.sagepub.com/>
- Yates, R., & Muchisky, D. (2003). On reconceptualizing teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 135-147. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588468>
- Zannirato, A., & Sánchez-Serrano, L. (2009). Using evaluation to design foreign language teacher training in a literature program. In J. M. Norris, J. McE. Davis, C. Sinicrope, & Y. Wantanabe (Eds.), *Toward useful program evaluation in college foreign language education* (pp. 97-116). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai‘i, National Foreign Language Resource Center.

APPENDIX 1

BA Program Objectives and Student Learning Outcomes

Upon graduating from the BA in SLS, students will:

1. Manifest the skills, understandings, and dispositions necessary to be exceptional language professionals
2. Demonstrate critical thinking and awareness of issues within the context of their professional work and social practice
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the value bases of their professional work
4. Interpret the history of second and foreign language study and its contemporary issues
5. Critically evaluate and make use of research into the learning, use, structure, and pedagogy of second languages
6. Develop and apply sound frameworks to the assessment and evaluation of institutions and agents involved in second language instruction, planning, and policy
7. Show an understanding of local language issues of Hawai'i and the Pacific in their professional work
8. Be able to prepare minority language students to acquire the academic literacies that would allow them to succeed in educational institutions
9. Improve the quality of teaching and learning of second, foreign, and heritage languages, in the state of Hawai'i, domestically, and abroad

Additional program goal: Upon graduating from the BA in SLS, students will be prepared to apply for admission to graduate programs in second language studies, applied linguistics, or related fields.

APPENDIX 2

Survey Instruments

Student Survey

1. How many semesters have you studied in an institution of higher learning? (Include your current semester.)
 - a. 1 – 2 semesters
 - b. 3 – 4 semesters
 - c. 5 – 6 semesters
 - d. 7 – 8 semesters
 - e. 9 or more

2. Before the Fall 2011 Semester, what was your declared major?
 - a. Second Language Studies (SLS)
 - b. Interdisciplinary Studies
 - c. Other (Please specify)

3. At this time, what are your future plans upon graduation?
 - a. Teacher in SLS field
 - b. Non-teaching professional in SLS field
 - c. Graduate student in SLS-related discipline
 - d. Not sure
 - e. Other (Please Specify)

4. Are you, or have you previously, worked or volunteered as a teacher, tutor, or in a related position in the SLS field (For examples: teacher assistant)?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

5. If you answered “Yes” to Question 4, please specify the following: (a) Work or volunteer title(s), (b) the number of hours you work/ed or volunteer/ed per week, (c) the number of months you worked or volunteered.. (Example: English Tutor, 2hr/wk, 6 months)

6. If you answered “No” to Question #4, what was the reason you have not volunteered or worked in the SLS field?

7. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I believe I will be sufficiently prepared for professional work in the SLS field upon graduation.
 - a. Strongly agree

- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer...

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: It is necessary for students pursuing a BA in SLS to gain teaching or related experience while completing their degree.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer...

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

I am able to identify opportunities to gain teaching or related experience without guidance or support.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

I am comfortable contacting organizations or individuals to establish work or volunteering opportunities without guidance or support.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

I feel capable of learning from a teaching experience opportunity without guidance or support.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

10. How many hours per week would you commit to gaining teaching or related experience in addition to your regular schedule?

11. If you feel that gaining teaching experience is necessary, to what extent do you agree with the following statements?

The SLS Department should...

...Provide structured teaching experience and guidance for BA student learning through a teaching practicum.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide structured teaching opportunities with little guidance through internships.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide unstructured or semi-structured teaching opportunities within courses (For example, service-learning)

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide information to students in order to identify self-directed volunteer teaching opportunities

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Encourage students to gain experience but should NOT provide further support or guidance.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree

- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Not do anything; Students are responsible for their own professional preparation and learning.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

12. In an ideal world, what type of teaching or related experience(s) would you want within your SLS degree program? Why?
13. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add related to gaining teaching or related experience while completing a BA degree in SLS?

Faculty Survey

1. Please select your current status
 - a. PhD student
 - b. SLS Faculty member
 - c. Other (Please Specify)

2. Are you a current or former member of the SLS BA Committee?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
3. Please list the undergraduate (100-400 level) courses you taught in the SLS department over the previous three semesters. Please list course numbers. (For example, 360)
4. Is gaining teaching or related experience a component of your current or past SLS undergraduate course syllabi?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: I have a sense of my SLS BA students' future plans and goals.
 - a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree
6. To what extend do you agree with the following statements:

Students are able to establish opportunities to gain teaching or related experience without guidance or support.

 - a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree

Students are capable of learning from a teaching or related experience without guidance or support.

 - a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree

- d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree
7. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: Gaining teaching or related experience is needed for BA SLS students to achieve the SLS BA program goals and student learning outcomes (SLOs)?
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer...

8. To what extent do you agree with the following statement: It is necessary for students pursuing a BA in SLS to gain teaching or related experience while completing their degree.
- a. Strongly agree
 - b. Tend to Agree
 - c. Neither agree nor disagree
 - d. Tend to disagree
 - e. Strongly disagree

Please explain your answer...

9. To what extent do you agree with the following statements:

The SLS Department should...

...Provide structured teaching experience and guidance for BA student learning through a teaching practicum.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide structured teaching opportunities with little guidance through internships.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide unstructured or semi-structured teaching opportunities within courses (For example, service-learning)

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Provide information to students in order to identify self-directed volunteer teaching opportunities

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Encourage students to gain experience but should NOT provide further support or guidance.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

...Not do anything; Students are responsible for their own professional preparation and learning.

- a. Strongly agree
- b. Tend to Agree
- c. Neither agree nor disagree
- d. Tend to disagree
- e. Strongly disagree

10. In an ideal world, what type of teaching or related experience(s) would you want within your SLS degree program? Why?

11. If you believe students pursuing a BA in SLS do not need to gain teaching or related professional experience, why do you believe this?

12. Do you have any additional comments you would like to add related to gaining teaching or professional experience within the SLS BA program?

APPENDIX 3
Delphi Techniques

Delphi Technique Phase I

Dear _____,

Thank you for participating in this Delphi technique for the BA program evaluation, you are one of nine participants. This is a consensus forming process aimed at defining teaching experience and it's characteristics in the context of the SLS BA program.

Please respond to the following questions no later than 5:00pm on Wednesday, November 16 by replying to this email with your responses. After 5:00pm on Wednesday I will begin grouping all participants' responses.

Delphi Part I: Brainstorm. Please provide concise responses to the following two questions.

- a) What do you believe is the definition of a teaching experience, particularly in regards to the SLS BA program?

A teaching experience is...

- b) What do you believe are the characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience, particularly in regards to SLS BA students?

Characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience include...

Delphi Technique Phase Two

Dear _____,

Thank you for your continued participation in Part II of the Delphi technique, a consensus forming process aimed at defining teaching experience and its characteristics in the

context of the SLS BA program. Attached are the collected responses from Part I of this process. Following the directions below, please rank the nine "definitions of teaching experience" and nine "characteristics of a meaningful experience" and return your rankings by 5:00pm on Sunday, November 20. After 5:00pm on Sunday, I will begin grouping all participant rankings. These will be sent out on Monday morning for Part III (re-ranking).

Delphi Part II: Ranking

At the end of this three-part process, the agreed upon definition of (a) teaching experience and (b) characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience will be used to guide how the SLS Department may meet the perceived need for teaching experience in the BA program.

Directions

1. Open the attachment
2. Select your level of agreement with each statement of the nine "definitions of teaching experience" and nine "characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience" in two
3. Save your rankings and email them back as an attachment.

These directions are modeled on the attachment.

Delphi Technique Phase Three

Dear _____,

Thank you for your responses and participation in Part III (Final Step) of the Delphi technique, a consensus forming process aimed at defining teaching experience and its characteristics in the context of the SLS BA program.

Attached are the ranked responses from Part II of this process. Following the directions below, please re-rank the "definitions of teaching experience" and "characteristics of a meaningful experience" based on initial rankings and return your re-rankings by 5:00pm on Sunday,

November 27. After 5:00pm on Sunday, I will compile final rankings. This will be reported out on Wednesday, November 3.

Delphi Part III: Consensus (Re-ranking)

At the end of this process, the agreed upon definitions of (a) teaching experience and (b) characteristics of a meaningful teaching experience will be used to guide how the SLS Department may meet the perceived need for teaching experience in the BA program.

Directions

1. Open the attachment
2. Consider the group ranking of teaching experience and characteristics of teaching experience for SLS BA students. Based on these, please RE-RANK the statements based on your level of agreement with each statement and agreement with the group.
3. Save your rankings and email them back as an attachment.

These directions are discussed on the attachment.

APPENDIX 4

Focus Group Protocol

1. Introduction: This focus group is part of a larger program evaluation project looking at the potential need for BA students to gain teaching experience, and if it's a need, how to best meet the need. The goal of this focus group is not to reach consensus but to have rich discussion about remaining questions within the evaluation.

2. Opening Question: (5 min)

Does everybody know each other?

3. Key Question One: (15 min)

Last year we did an exercise to help define what is a “meaningful teaching experience” for BA students. We found certain elements of teaching were repeated and these are listed on the handout in front of you. Please take a moment to look at these and circle the three or four that you think are the most important for BA students to experience while teaching.

Act of teaching
 Amount of teaching experience
 Classroom Observation
 Feedback
 Evaluation
 Instructor-supported learning
 Lesson planning
 Materials development
 Micro-teaching
 Practicum
 Private tutoring
 Reflection
 Student-teaching learning
 Volunteer teaching

Please tell us about what you circled.

Is there anything you would take off the list?

Is there anything missing?

4. Key Question Two (15 min)

On the survey last year faculty rated different options for students to gain teaching experience. We found an interesting contrast in the findings. On the one hand, faculty preferred an option for students to gain teaching experience through self-directed volunteer teaching. On the other hand, faculty reported students are not able to establish and learn from teaching experiences without support.

Why do you think this is?

5. Key Question Three (15 min)

On the handout in front of you are some options for students to gain teaching experience.

- *Self-directed volunteer teaching*
- *Teaching practicum*
- *Service-learning: volunteer teaching as a component of a course*
- *Internships*

Can you think of other options for students to gain teaching experience?

What options do you think would be easier to implement?

What options do you think would be harder to implement?

6. Closing Question (10 min)

This focus group is part of a larger evaluation investigating the need for BA students to gain teaching experience and how to potentially meet this need. Findings from this evaluation will be used to make decisions about the program and its future.

Is there anything that you had wanted to say but didn't get a chance?

APPENDIX 5

Delphi Results

Teaching Experience

<i>Item A</i>	...an activity or event organized by a teacher to result in some kind of learning experience for another person. Involves conceiving, planning, and delivering educational experiences of various kinds, including class-based lessons, formative assessments, extra-curricular activities, or other educational events (e.g., online experiences, project-based experiences, community service, etc.). With regard to the SLS BA program, such events focus on the learning of additional language(s), primarily, though in a way mindful of the inherently political nature of language teaching and related issues of social justice.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	4.44	5	1.33	1	0	0	1	7

<i>Item I</i>	Any activities that involve lesson planning, material development, teaching (and evaluation) - e.g.) micro teaching, volunteer work related to language teaching, private informal tutoring, teaching							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	4.44	5	0.73	0	0	1	3	5

<i>Item F</i>	A teaching experience is something that you gain by actually undergoing some sort of teaching practice, e.g. peer teaching, micro-teaching, or practicum. For example, you can design a 10-minute pedagogical activity and implement that to a group of students, simulated or real.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.78	4	1.20	1	0	1	5	2

<p><i>Item B</i></p> <p>A teaching experience is... either: microteaching a group of classmates a lesson which has been developed as a process over several weeks of a course, or teaching a group of real students in a real class with the assistance and constructive criticism of an experienced teacher and/or teacher trainer a lesson that has been developed as a process over several weeks of a course.</p> <p>A teaching experience may be co teaching with an experienced teacher or teacher trainer.</p> <p>A teaching experience may also be participant observation of a class which is led by a professional teacher or teacher trainer.</p> <p>A teaching experience may also be several sessions of focused classroom observation of a professional teacher or teacher trainer.</p>								
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.67	5	1.41	1	1	1	3	3

<p><i>Item H</i></p> <p>A teaching experience is...as the name implies, the opportunity to experience teaching first hand. I think it could initially take the form of "practice teaching" such as mini lessons taught to fellow SLS students who are role-playing being language students. I imagine, to be effective, it would take a "scaffolding approach" such as the SLS students conduct mini lessons, with lots of guidance from the SLS instructor; these are gradually expanded into lengthier lessons, with gradually growing independence of the SLS students. This experience could be followed by (or end in) the novice teachers/SLS students teaching an actual class of real students. Similarly, it could also take the approach of "volunteer assistant teacher"- so, in this scenario, the SLS student is paired with a veteran teacher who is teaching a class over a period of time. The novice teacher starts by observing the teacher, and gradually assists with lessons. Eventually, the novice teacher plans part of a lesson and teaches it, and eventually plans and conducts an entire lesson (or more, depending). In both scenarios, the novice teacher gradually gains experience teaching.</p>								
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.67	2	1.32	0	3	0	3	3

<i>Item G</i>	A teaching experience involves working with one or more students to help them learn content or develop ability (ideally this content or ability is related to a second language, but does not necessarily have to be) that the student is truly learning,							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.11	3	1.05	0	3	3	2	1

<i>Item D</i>	One where the student has an opportunity to design a lesson plan (in conjunction with an experienced teacher) and implement it; learn classroom management and personal time management in regards to classroom prep.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	2.89	3	0.93	1	1	5	2	0

<i>Item E</i>	Any kinds of L2 tutoring and classroom instruction would be counted as L2 teaching experience as long as it is operated under systematic curriculum that include specific SLOs for each class.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	2.89	3	1.36	1	3	3	0	2

<i>Item C</i>	A teaching experience includes planning effective lesson plans to create meaningful opportunities for students to learn second/foreign languages in relation with course objectives and curriculum, and developing tests to evaluate whether students successfully learned the intended learning outcomes.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	2.78	3	0.97	0	4	4	0	1

Meaningful Teaching Experience

				Preparing an appropriate lesson plan with a teacher or teacher trainer Preparing (selecting, adapting, rejecting, and supplementing (SARS)ing) appropriate materials with a teacher or teacher trainer Developing a rapport with the students Communicating at the correct level of speed and difficulty for the students Giving clear instructions Modeling activities Managing the classroom: pace, timing, and discipline Answering questions Grouping students Selecting students for in class report activities Dealing with the affordances and constraints of the teaching environment Giving implicit and explicit positive and negative feedback Developing student's abilities over the course of a lesson in order to demonstrate a student learning objective Providing opportunities for students to employ a variety of learning styles or multiple intelligences across the activities of the lesson Using one's technical, linguistic, or other abilities to facilitate learning in the classroom				
<i>Item B</i>								
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	4.33	5	1.00	0	1	0	3	5

				I believe the BA students/novice teachers need models of teachers. These could be videos or the opportunity to observe teachers "in action" or both. I think reflection is another key component. So, the experience of observing, planning lessons and teaching, needs to be combined with some meaningful reflection. This could take the form of journals, for example, or some sort of post-"experience" (observation, practice teaching, real teaching) discussion in the SLS class or among the teachers themselves to consider what "worked" or what could be improved, how to approach the lesson next time, etc.. It could also take the form of a more formal assignment or assignments. I believe novice teachers also need, specific, practical guidance and feedback in how to teach. This could come through readings and also being observed and critiqued by (experienced veteran) teachers, such as the SLS instructor, peers or the cooperating teacher. I think another characteristic of a meaningful teaching experience is enough time or a good amount of real experience teaching. That is, an hour teaching is not enough. I don't know the magic number, but 20-30 hours teaching would have meaning, I think.				
<i>Item H</i>								
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	4.33	5	1.00	0	1	0	3	5

<i>Item F</i>	Planning, execution of a lesson plan, evaluation of some sort, and reflection for future improvement. Peer evaluation or teacher evaluation can be a component for this. Or they can view their own teaching video and ask peer feedback, as part of improving and gaining more meaningful experience. For BA students, they may not be a semester-long experience, but a series of brief micro-lesson in language schools, or similar type of simulated teachings to their classmates.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	4.11	5	0.93	0	0	3	2	4

<i>Item I</i>	Students... (Gain the basic linguistic concepts and learn about various teaching techniques/methods as well as classroom management skills.) Visit language classes and observe experienced teachers Study teaching materials Learn how to construct lessons and write lesson plans Conduct the lessons as micro-teaching and reflect on their teaching/share ideas with classmates Ideally, have opportunities to teach actual learners (private tutoring or teaching practicum, for example) And I think it's important that SLS students be guided by their instructor through all these steps							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.78	4	1.48	1	1	1	2	4

<i>Item D</i>	Work inside and outside the classroom, assisting individual students and groups (small and large), drafting lesson plans, correcting homework, running activities, working with textbooks, and reflecting on the experience with other students.							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.67	4	0.87	0	1	2	5	1

<i>Item A</i>	As much realia as possible (e.g., real students, real situations, via service teaching—or mock-teaching performances that are as life-like as possible, via classroom role plays).							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.56	4	1.24	1	0	3	3	2

<i>Item G</i>	<p>Some (or all) of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * assessing the students' abilities and needs * selecting or developing materials, tasks, activities and/or projects that fit the students' needs, levels, motivations, and interests (or combining teacher-led selection of materials with student-selected content) * facilitating/implementing these materials, tasks, activities and/or projects * assessing students' progress and making adjustments to materials and instruction to match <p>NOTE: my feeling is that these can be done in private tutoring sessions or in classes with 30 or more students.</p> <p>NOTE 2: my feeling is also that a classroom presentation of a lesson plan is more of a "presentation" than a true teaching experience.</p>							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.33	4	1.41	1	2	1	3	2

<i>Item E</i>	Setting up clear SLOs both for long-term (for entire course) and for short-term (for each sessions/classes), reflect after each class and each semester if and to what extent SLOs have been accomplished, at least try to re-design one's teaching approach and philosophies based on the reflections (and possibly from course evaluation by students).							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.22	3	1.30	1	1	4	1	2

<i>Item C</i>	Effective lesson plans, understandings of students' second/foreign language learning experience, material development, valid and reliable test development, understandings of program's curriculum							
Round II	Mean	Mode	SD	Strongly Disagree	Tend to Disagree	Neither Disagree/Agree	Tend to Agree	Strongly Agree
	3.11	2	1.05	0	3	3	2	1