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Evaluation of a Teacher Induction Program in a U.S. University English Language Institute: Towards Useful Evaluation

Abstract

The study reported here is a formative and internal evaluation of new teacher induction practices in a U.S. university ESL program. By adopting a utilization-focused approach, the evaluation produced findings that served the information needs of the evaluation users. The findings were then used to develop and improve the program practices. This paper calls for attention to proper uses and utility of evaluations in language education programs, and illustrates through the study how a utilization-focused approach can help to ensure the actual uses and enhance the utility of evaluation practices.

Introduction

As a burgeoning profession, language program evaluation is finding increasing recognition and demand in language education programs and in applied linguistics. In his explication of a systematic approach to language program design and development, Brown (1995) points out that evaluation is the heart that connects and gives blood to all the other program elements. Unfortunately, at its early stages, evaluation was often used inappropriately and poorly, with a primary focus on making judgments about language programs based solely on experimental designs and limited quantitative analyses. More recently, practitioners have begun to see evaluation as capable of informing program development, and a focus on program processes (in addition to products) has gained significant attention in this regard (Beretta, 1992a; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Lynch, 1996).
Despite this positive progression, the central concern of the uses for language program evaluation has yet to be resolved. A major question in language education and applied linguistics is how we can ensure and maximize the uses and usefulness of an evaluation, from the point of view of the program and major stakeholders. In addressing this area of need, I found Patton’s (1997) utilization-focused approach to evaluation particularly valuable. Taking this approach, I, together with an assistant, facilitated an evaluation of a teacher induction program in a U.S. university English Language Institute. The evaluation demonstrates the great potential of a utilization-focused approach to language program evaluation, the procedures it should involve, and most importantly, the uses it can bring about. In this paper, I will first provide a brief review of the historical development and current status of language program evaluation, and then I will justify a utilization-focused approach to evaluation. I then report the evaluation study in detail, illustrating the application of a utilization-focused approach and its outcomes.

Language Program Evaluation

Definitions and Purposes of Program Evaluation

Program evaluation has been defined differently with different evaluation foci, purposes and methods, with various understandings of program, and with varied degrees of specificity. For example, Scriven (1991) defines evaluation as “the process of determining the merit, worth, and value of things” (p. 1). Weiss (1998) refers to evaluation as “systematic assessment of the operation and/or the outcomes of a program or policy, compared to explicit or implicit standards, in order to help improve the program or policy” (p. 18). Although different program contexts and evaluation purposes might see value in which definition is useful, there may be no single best definition of evaluation. The working definition adopted here is “the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs to make judgments
about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming” (Patton, 1997, p. 23). The merits of Patton’s definition are evident in its effort to outline major categories of evaluation foci and purposes with unspecified and negotiable evaluation methods, while emphasizing systematic inquiry. The definition clarification here is very necessary since it affects how we view evaluation and how we think it should be done.

Scriven (1967) made the important distinction between formative and summative evaluation, when he described two major purposes of evaluation in educational contexts. Formative evaluation serves the purpose of developing and improving a program by examining program practices and providing feedback on them. Summative evaluation takes on the purpose of making judgments about a program by finding out overall program effectiveness, often affecting the future of the program (e.g., continuance, expansion, or termination). For example, a formative end-of-semester course evaluation can be used by the program to find out the strengths and weaknesses of the course, and thus to revise the course accordingly. However, a summative evaluation of an educational project can be used by the funders to judge the worth of the project and decide whether it should be continued or terminated.

Besides the above two important purposes, an evaluation could also fulfill many other purposes, for example, generating program knowledge, educating, empowering, and so on. Evaluation can often help the stakeholders to gain more knowledge and understanding about the program; it can be used to foster a learning culture in the program; it can also be utilized to involve participation and to give voice to those who are neglected, marginalized or disadvantaged. With all of these and many other possibilities, it is very important to observe that an evaluation allows multiple purposes, and different stakeholders may envision different purposes of an evaluation. The evaluators thus have the responsibility to negotiate clear and
useful purposes with the program stakeholders so that the evaluation can be done with appropriate methods and can be used to its fullest extent.

**Historical Overview of Language Program Evaluation**

Early Judgmental and Outcomes-driven Evaluations

Language program evaluation, in its early development (around the mid 20th century) and alongside program evaluations in general education and other social/governmental domains, was largely used for judgmental purposes, with a near-exclusive focus on measuring program outcomes (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Lynch, 1996). Evaluations in the early decades (1950s-1970s) were mostly summative in nature, judging the successfulness of the programs usually through external inspections. Language program evaluations in this period were also mostly focused on comparisons of teaching methods and materials, with the intent of testing language learning theories, and adopting a positivistic paradigm that utilized large-scale experimental quantitative research methods (Lynch, 1996). For example, early evaluations of this sort compared audio-lingual method with traditional grammar-translation or some other form of traditional language teaching methodology (e.g., Keating, 1963; Chastain & Woerdehoff, 1968; Scherer & Wertheimer, 1964; Smith, 1970).

Criticisms of these early evaluations included: (a) their questionable validity, due to lack of control in using experimental and control groups and unreliable test instruments; (b) weak generalizability of the findings, due to the diverse program contexts and variables of the studies; (c) invalid assumption of a causal link between instructional method and learning outcomes; (d) inadequate or almost no attention to the instructional processes and learning processes; and (e) low capacity to provide information conducive to program development and improvement (Berretta, 1992a; Greenwood, 1985; Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Lynch, 1996). And above all,
as Patton (1997) observed, these early evaluations taking the quantitative paradigm fundamentally did not get used or bring about any change in programs since they could not provide answers to the questions under investigation or even failed to ask the questions and there were basically no linkages established between methods and uses.

Developmental and Process-oriented Evaluation

In response to early criticisms, from around the 1980s, evaluations in language education shifted attention to classroom and program processes, and these changes led to a greater possibility of informing program development (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005; Lynch, 1996). This shift was in line with that of mainstream evaluation to the worth and development of programs starting from the 1970s (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005). A formative function emerged in those evaluations, looking at what goes on within a program in order to generate information for program improvement. Naturalistic and qualitative evaluations, examining classroom processes, student and teacher perceptions, curriculum, materials, and so on, began to take place as a stand-alone approach or as an addition to the traditional experimental and judgmental approach (Lynch, 1996). Language program evaluation continued to retain a focus on testing learning theory, including communicative language teaching, task-based language teaching, and other theoretically motivated approaches to pedagogic practice (e.g., Beretta & Davies, 1985; Mitchell, 1992; Palmer, 1992). Nevertheless, the addition of naturalistic and qualitative methods allowed evaluation to incorporate an understanding of the process of a program and other program elements. In addition, as Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005) noted, “[i]n recent years, the study of language learning has largely migrated from the domain of evaluation to that of research” (p. 62). That is, a distinction was drawn during this period between program evaluation and scientific research. In his reflection of the Bangalore project, Beretta (1992b) rightly pointed out that the
primary function of an evaluation is “to contribute to practice not to theory” (p. 257), and an evaluation should start with negotiating uses and answerable questions of the evaluation for a specific program context, not with pre-determined scheme of theory-testing.

Despite the increased attention to formative evaluation, summative evaluation using external inspection remains the predominant practice in language program evaluation to date (Thomas, 2003). Learning outcomes remain the central concern as the evaluation focus. Often times, evaluation is called upon to check value for money or for accreditation purposes. As a matter of fact, as Norris (2006) points out, the focus of higher education accreditation in the U.S. has moved towards student learning outcomes assessment, since learning outcomes are considered as an apparent and essential indicator of educational effectiveness. However, it should be acknowledged that evaluation has grown over the years into professional practice, allowing more feasibility of making evaluation useful to both external funding or accrediting agencies and to internal program constituents as well, thus serving both summative and formative purposes (cf. Byrd & Constantinides, 1991; Mackay, 1994; Norris, 2006). Although language program evaluation still needs considerable advancement in areas of knowledge base and good practices, it has a good amount to draw upon and to learn from mainstream evaluation, which has developed into an established discipline with many professional organizations (e.g., American Evaluation Association; European Evaluation Society) and academic journals (e.g., The American Journal of Evaluation; Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis). The more encouraging picture shows that some language programs have begun to see the development value of evaluation, by requesting external evaluation or by engaging in regular internal evaluation to understand how good they are and to seek information useful for further
development (e.g., Dassier & Powell, 2001; Lynch, 2000; Mackay, Wellesley, Tasman, & Bazergan, 1998).

Perhaps the most important recent advance in language program evaluation is the increased attention being paid to one central concern for all evaluations: their utility, that is, their capacity to be properly used. Beretta (1992a) anticipated that language program evaluators of the 1990s would aim at providing utilizable information to their clients and program stakeholders. Kiely and Rea-Dickins (2005) pointed out that it goes without saying that evaluation process and findings should be used (p. 37). Norris (2006) called for utilizing student learning outcomes assessment for program learning and improvement instead of simply ‘doing it’ in college foreign language programs in the U.S. Indeed, utility is listed as the top priority in professional evaluation standards, before feasibility, propriety, and accuracy (Joint Committee, 1994). Unfortunately, in the real world of evaluation practices, making evaluation useful and getting evaluations actually used have been major challenges. In the history of language program evaluation, “[e]valuation use has been a persistent problem” (Kiely & Rea-Dickins, 2005, p. 39). This trend was particularly evident in the early summative and outcomes-driven evaluations focusing on methods comparisons. Among the literature and practice addressing the key issue of utility of evaluation, I have found Michael Quinn Patton’s (1997) utilization-focused evaluation approach particularly illuminating, practical, and instructional on how to make evaluations truly useful.

**Utilization-focused Evaluation**

Envisioning the centrality of evaluation use, and responding to the serious problem of underuse, nonuse, and even misuse of evaluation findings, Michael Quinn Patton (1978; 1986; 1997) suggested and developed utilization-focused evaluation (UFE). The essence of UFE is that
it is “done for and with specific, intended primary users for specific, intended uses” (Patton, 1997, p. 23). It is “a comprehensive framework within which to develop and implement an evaluation with attention to use built in” (Patton, 1997, p. 20, emphasis in original). Utilization-focused evaluation starts with identifying primary intended users (PIU), negotiating with them the purposes and intended uses of the evaluation, and generating among the PIUs a commitment to the evaluation and its uses. In this manner, uses of the evaluation are clarified and built in from the very beginning, with evaluation users committed to participation throughout the process. The subsequent evaluation activities, including the design, data collection, and analysis and presentation of evaluation findings, all find their guidance from and strong association with the pre-specified intended uses. With this approach, the utility of an evaluation can be greatly enhanced, and the process and findings of the evaluation can be actually used.

Different from many other evaluation approaches, the evaluators in UFE work collaboratively with the primary intended users and facilitate the PIUs’ decisions about the purposes, uses, focus, design, and implementation of the evaluation (Patton, 1997). The evaluators’ roles are more like that of a facilitator, negotiator, collaborator, coordinator, and consultant, not that of decision-maker or judge. The primary intended users are the people who make major decisions of what the evaluation is about, how it shall proceed, and how it shall be used. Working under this mode of interaction with PIUs, evaluators need to be “situationally responsive” (p. 134) and “active-reactive-adaptive” (p. 134), in order to meet the information needs of a distinct program and its people, and to respond to changing, evolving, and dynamic program situations (Patton, 1997).

Unfortunately, the application of utilization-focused evaluation in language education is scant to date. The only other evaluation that has specifically adopted this approach in the L2
literature is John Norris’ (2004) “Validity Evaluation in Foreign Language Assessment”. In response to the challenge of ensuring the assessment qualities in U.S. college foreign language education, Norris (2004) proposed a reconceptualization of assessment validation as validity evaluation, and he provided a framework for applying a utilization-focused program evaluation approach for assessment validation. A three-year evaluation of the placement assessment program at Georgetown University German Department facilitated by the author illustrated the potentials, procedures, and benefits of utilization-focused validity evaluation for validating such assessments. Norris (2004) concluded that a utilization-focused evaluation approach “[provided] mechanisms for local experts to contribute the substance of program context and evaluation needs, and for the external evaluator to contribute a methodological framework and associated recommendations” (pp. 450-451). Perhaps most importantly, the evaluation process and findings were put to use to develop and revise the program and to ensure that the placement assessment was actually serving its intended uses. Similar to Norris’ (2004) study, the current study applied a utilization-focused approach in a language education context. However, in this study, the focus was on evaluating a teacher induction program within a U.S. university ESL institute, and the evaluation was initiated and facilitated by program-internal evaluators.

Program Context

The program in focus was the pre-semester induction program for newly-hired teachers in the English Language Institute (ELI), University of Hawaii at Manoa (UHM). An induction program encompasses practices that help new or beginning teachers to conduct appropriate and effective teaching in the particular educational context they work within. The ELI is part of the Department of Second Language Studies (DSLS) at UHM:
The primary purpose of the ELI is to provide English instruction for international and immigrant students who have been admitted to the university and who do not speak English as a native language, in order to facilitate their academic studies. (ELI, 2003)

The ELI consists of three administrators (Executive Director, Director, and Coordinator) and 18 teachers (as of Spring 2006). The ELI teachers are all graduate students enrolled in the DSLS, working as Graduate Assistants (GA). In this institutional context, every semester, there is change in the teaching staff, as teachers who are graduating leave and new teachers are hired. Thus, there is a constant need for the ELI to provide pre-semester induction and training to new teachers, in order to facilitate their getting prepared for teaching in the ELI.

The evaluation was initiated by two ELI teachers (me as the primary investigator, and another teacher as assistant) in Spring 2006 semester, in conjunction with our coursework for a seminar on language program evaluation. The proposal of the evaluation focus thus emerged from our concern for the program as teachers. Having gone through the teacher induction program, we had perceived gaps between what was provided and what was needed in order to prepare for teaching and to pursue teaching-related activities. In particular, the fact that all of the teachers are graduate students and may not have had previous education or teaching experience in a context similar to that of the ELI (especially those who are international students), invited the question of how well the program prepares these teachers for their roles in the ELI. This concern for teacher development was also well articulated by the ELI as part of its research agenda. The ELI (2003) noted, “What can the ELI do to help beginning and continuing GA instructors?” In our initial contact with the three ELI administrators, they all showed great interest in and support for the current evaluation project with a focus on teacher development.
Based on initial discussions with the ELI administrators, existing program documents, and our own experiences and observations, we, together with the administrators, agreed upon the scope and content of the pre-semester induction program for ELI new teachers. This program includes the following twelve practices which new teachers will or could engage in, in order to prepare themselves for teaching in the ELI: (a) doing the ELI job interview, (b) attending an orientation meeting with the Director, (c) attending an orientation meeting with the Coordinator, (d) meeting with lead teacher of curriculum area, (e) observing ELI classes, (f) talking to ELI teachers, (g) reading the ELI Teacher’s Manual, (h) reading the ELI website, (i) reading the curriculum area readings, (j) previewing textbook/teaching materials (including the online resource room), (k) attending the all-ELI meeting, and (l) doing an internship. At the time of the evaluation, the required practices for all new teachers in the ELI were the following three: (a) doing the ELI job interview, (b) attending an orientation meeting with the Director, and (c) attending the all-ELI meeting. The remaining practices were optional.

**Primary Intended Users, Purposes, and Intended Uses**

With the evaluation focus in mind, we identified the ELI administrators (Executive Director, Director, and Coordinator), as the primary intended users (PIUs) of this evaluation. In addition to running other aspects of the overall program, these individuals are responsible for supervising the teachers of the ELI, including taking care of the teacher induction and development programs. They are the people who can actually make decisions about the program and its future, based on the evaluation findings and process. In other words, they are the people who will be able to use the evaluation. We thus decided to work closely and collaboratively with them throughout the evaluation process. To start with, we first sought to engage them in deciding the evaluation’s purposes and intended uses, and then to identify appropriate corresponding
methods. We, as internal evaluators, facilitated this process by proposing evaluation plans and activities to the PIUs, seeking their thoughts, comments, and priorities, and negotiating with them about what would work best for the program and the evaluation.

As a starting point, in an Evaluation Statement document (Appendix A), we proposed to the PIUs a utilization-focused approach to the evaluation, informed them how the PIUs and the internal evaluators would work together and what their different roles would be, and proposed the anticipated intended uses of the evaluation based on our early informal conversations and observations. In the document, we explained how they were identified as the PIUs and emphasized their important roles in the evaluation. At the same time, we made it clear to them that we would do all the evaluation work, but they would make final decisions on what the evaluation was to accomplish and how it was to proceed. We also stressed how crucial it was to specify intended uses of the evaluation from the very beginning. Along with the Evaluation Statement, through an on-line survey (Appendix B), we sought their understandings of the evaluation purposes and their roles in the evaluation as PIUs, and above all, their agreement or disagreement with the anticipated intended uses. The results of the survey showed that the PIUs perceived generating program knowledge, and developing and improving program practices, as the purposes of the evaluation. Their descriptions of their perceived roles showed their commitment to the uses of the evaluation findings and the involvement in the evaluation process as decision-makers.

Reacting to the four intended uses we anticipated and proposed, which are listed in Table 1 below, the PIUs all showed strong agreement with potential uses 1, 2, and 3. For the fourth intended use, two of the PIUs expressed ‘Very Important’ while the third expressed ‘Somewhat Unimportant’. It was later confirmed with the third PIU that he or she would consider the fourth
use as important on the condition that the evaluation turned out to be solid and useful. The internal evaluators further assured the PIUs that they would strive to carry out the evaluation with both rigorous and directly useful methods and processes in order to fulfill the identified potential uses of the evaluation. In addition, one additional potential use was identified by one of the PIUs, which was, “Possibly we can use it if we are asked to justify our practices overall. That is, having an evaluation done shows we are being ‘professional’.” It was confirmed later with the PIU that the ELI could possibly use the evaluation to justify the ELI practices to the Chair of DSLS, Graduate Chair and Graduate Faculty of DSLS, Dean of the College, and other interested parties. The results of the survey were reported back in a document via email to the PIUs to summarize what they agreed on as the purposes and the intended uses of the evaluation, and to channel communication among them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Potential Uses of the Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Specifying what the new teacher development practices are trying to accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finding out how well the current new teacher development practices are able to meet new teachers’ needs and administrators’ expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identifying specific areas for improvement and suggesting ways for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Forming a basis for implementing necessary changes for the improvement of new teacher development practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focal Evaluation Questions**

Based on the agreed-upon intended uses, the following question was developed to focus the evaluation activities:

*How well are the pre-semester induction practices helping new teachers to get ready for the teaching tasks in the ELI?*

The internal evaluators generated and proposed the question, and the PIUs found it reasonable and agreed to pursuing it. In order to answer the question above, another evaluation question was generated in terms of the program’s goals and objectives:
What are the intended outcomes of the pre-semester induction practices for new teachers in the ELI?

Evaluation Design and Methods

In order to answer the evaluation questions adequately with available resources, four evaluation methods were used to gather data from different groups of stakeholders. These methods were: (a) interview with the ELI Administrators, (b) interviews with new ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester, (c) focus group with experienced ELI teachers in Spring 2006 semester, and (d) questionnaire for incoming ELI new teachers of Fall 2006 semester. The purposes of the evaluation and the evaluation activities were clearly conveyed to these stakeholders in the emails for contacting them and requesting them to participate. All of the contacts with the stakeholders also attempted to instill a sense of ownership of the evaluation among them. It was made clear to the stakeholders that their input and feedback were highly valued, and would help to generate program knowledge and to develop the program. These attempts aimed at increasing stakeholders’ participation and maximizing the usefulness of the evaluation.

We, the internal evaluators, drafted and proposed the evaluation design and methods at this point (See Appendix C for the overall Evaluation Plan and Timeline that we proposed). The primary intended users executed a final check on the design by providing their thoughts and comments for each evaluation method proposed. Their thoughts and comments were taken into consideration when revising and improving the evaluation methods. One of the PIUs also enhanced the utility of the design by sending emails to the different groups of teachers to encourage them to participate, prior to or after the internal evaluators sent the request emails to the teachers.
Interview with the ELI Administrators

The major intended uses of the interview with the ELI administrators were to specify the intended outcomes of the pre-semester induction practices for ELI new teachers, and to find out the administrators’ satisfaction with the current practices in achieving the intended outcomes. At the same time, details about the current practices were confirmed with the administrators. Thus, the data collected from the interview could be used to fulfill the first intended use, to identify areas of uncertainty, and to provide some basic information for the design of the other evaluation methods. Since we needed to obtain from the administrators agreed-upon intended outcomes of the program and some of their common concerns about the program, we used group interview instead of other methods.

The interview was conducted with the ELI Executive Director and the ELI Director, at 12:30-1:45pm (length: 1 hour 15 minutes) on April 11, 2006, in Moore 551. The ELI Coordinator was not able to attend the interview, but provided input and comments on the interview results. Please refer to Appendix D for the interview questions. During the interview, we posed the questions in order, and elicited answers to the questions from both of the administrators. For example, in terms of the intended outcomes of the program, the two administrators took turns to articulate what was on their minds one by one. They also voiced their agreement/disagreement with and additional comment on what the other articulated. We then finalized the intended outcomes by confirming with them what they agreed on. The interview was audio-recorded, with hand-written notes as well.

Interviews with New ELI Teachers of Spring 2006 Semester

The major intended use of the interviews with new teachers was to find out how well the pre-semester induction practices were able to meet the new teachers’ perceived needs. Being in
their first semester of teaching in the ELI, the new teachers could freshly reflect on the pre-
semester induction process in helping them to get ready to teach in the ELI. We used interviews
since the interviews could allow us to obtain in-depth information, impressions and comments
from each new teacher about their program experiences.

Among the four new ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester, three were interviewed (the
fourth new teacher was one of the internal evaluators). The three interviews were respectively
conducted at 1:15-2:00pm (length: 45 minutes) on April 14, 2006, in Moore 471, 9:25-10:00am
(length: 35 minutes) on April 21, 2006, in Moore 551, and 10:05-10:55am (length: 50 minutes)
on April 21 in Moore 479. Please refer to Appendix E for the interview questions. During each
interview, we asked the questions in order, made sure we got answers to each of them, and tried
to obtain clearly-articulated and well-elaborated responses. We also elicited the responses in the
way that the teachers could feel free to express their thoughts and opinions as much as they
wanted, and wherever needed, we asked follow-up questions. Since these teachers seemed to be
very concerned about the program, each of them talked quite openly, honestly and earnestly, thus
providing very rich data. All the three interviews were audio-recorded, with hand-written notes
as well.

**Focus Group with Experienced ELI Teachers of Spring 2006 Semester**

The major intended use of the focus group was to find out experienced ELI teachers’
perceptions, comments, and suggestions on pre-semester induction practices for ELI new
teachers. As experienced ELI teachers, they could draw upon their past experiences in the ELI,
think about the desired outcomes of the pre-semester induction process, comment on the current
practices, and make any necessary suggestions. Focus group is a rather efficient method of
gathering participants’ thoughts and ideas on a topic of their common concerns in a short period
of time. In addition, it can promote generation of rich, in-depth and interesting responses when the participants interact as a group in a non-threatening environment. For these reasons, we used focus group and wanted these experienced teachers to have a discussion about the program as a group.

Among the twelve experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester, eleven of them attended the focus group, and the teacher who did not make the session had a teaching time conflict. The focus group was conducted at 12:00-1:15pm (length: 1 hour 15 minutes) of April 26, 2006, in Moore 551. During the focus group, two teachers arrived 15 minutes late, one teacher arrived 30 minutes late, and one teacher attended the first 30 minutes, all due to class time conflicts. The teacher who left early provided his additional input via email later. Please refer to Appendix F for the focus group questions. During the focus group, we first re-iterated the purpose and scope of the focus group, and set some ground rules to encourage even participation. We then moderated the focus group by raising the questions clearly, facilitating discussions among the teachers, and encouraging them to respond to and comment on what the others said. In the focus group, the teachers also filled out a short questionnaire (See Appendix F) rating the helpfulness of the current pre-semester induction practices, after which they discussed their comments and suggestions about the practices as a group. We obtained substantial information for the questions we raised, and focus group proved to be quite effective in getting at the information we needed. The focus group discussion was audio-recorded, with hand-written notes taken as well. The answers to Question # 1, that is, the desired outcomes of the program perceived by teachers, were also recorded on the chalk board as they were articulated to ensure accuracy of the information, and to provide a reference for answering question # 2.
Questionnaire for Incoming New ELI Teachers of Fall 2006 Semester

The major intended use of the questionnaire was to identify incoming ELI teachers’ needs and expectations for the pre-semester induction program. Incoming ELI teachers may have very little knowledge about teaching in the ELI, and their identified needs for the pre-semester induction program could be compared with the current practices in meeting their needs. Due to the small amount of information we needed from them and the relatively straightforward nature of the questions we wanted to ask of them, we chose to use a questionnaire format. The questionnaire could also elicit answers to the questions we raised in a non-threatening manner. Moreover, the fact that two of the five incoming teachers were in a foreign country made the options of interview or focus group much less feasible.

The questionnaire was administered online through a commercial survey tool (Surveymonkey.com, 2006). Before it was administered, it was piloted on several current M.A. students in DSLS, and was revised slightly based on their responses and feedback. There were altogether five incoming ELI new teachers, two of whom were incoming Ph.D. students in the DSLS, and three of whom were current M.A. students in the DSLS. All of the five incoming teachers responded to the questionnaire during the period of April 26th and April 29th. The questionnaire required ten to fifteen minutes to fill out. A converted version of the questionnaire is attached as Appendix G. All the questions were open-ended, and we asked direct questions about the most important knowledge they would like to gain and the most important experiences they would like to be able to get through the pre-semester orientation/induction process in order to prepare for teaching. The questionnaire results were collected from the online survey tool.
Data Analysis

The questions we asked in each of the above evaluation methods were highly structured ones, where we had a clear idea of what we were aiming for. For the interviews and focus group, we took down all the answers and responses to the questions using the participants’ exact words onto paper or into Word documents from the tapes with the help of a transcriber. For the questionnaire, we took down the answers to the questions that we collected from the online survey tool into a Word document. When designing the evaluation methods, we had certain themes in mind which we thought could address the focal evaluation questions, so we designed corresponding questions to obtain information about those themes. The main themes were intended/desired outcomes of the program, achieved or not; helpfulness of the current program practices; and teachers’ comments and suggestions for the program.

Whether the intended outcomes of the program were achieved definitely could provide a good answer to the main focal question of how well the program was doing its job to help incoming new teachers. Therefore, we first started by asking the ELI administrators to specify the intended outcomes of the program during our interview with them (Question # 1 in Appendix E). To get at the best information we could about whether these intended outcomes were achieved, in the interviews with new teachers of Spring 2006 semester, we asked them direct questions about whether they were able to achieve each of those outcomes through the pre-semester induction process they went through (Question # 4 in Appendix F). At the same time, we wanted to find out the desired outcomes of the program perceived by experienced ELI teachers during the focus group, so that we could compare what the administrators and the experienced teachers saw as needed by incoming new teachers (Question # 1 in Appendix G). This comparison could shed light on whether the intended outcomes the administrators specified
were actually meeting the new teachers’ needs. The data for this theme were collected across the above sources and were analyzed from the answers to the above questions.

In addition to examining the program products, we also had questions about the program processes, particularly about the helpfulness and usefulness of the current program practices, which were directly related to the focal question of how well these practices were helping the incoming teachers to prepare to teach. Thus we designed sets of questions related to this theme, for example, the first two questions in # 3 in the interviews with new teachers (Appendix E), questions # 3 (the questionnaire) and # 4 in the focus group of experienced teachers (Appendix F), and question # 4 in the questionnaire for incoming new teachers (Appendix G). When analyzing the data taken from these sources and questions, a major category of “the most helpful practices” emerged. The most direct answer to the question of “the most helpful practices” came from the results of the questionnaire used in the focus group of experienced teachers, where the teachers rated the helpfulness of each of the current practices. Besides this source, new teachers articulated the practices that they found particularly helpful when answering question # 3 in the interviews with them, and incoming new teachers articulated the most important things they would like to do or wish they could do in order to prepare for teaching when answering question # 4 in the questionnaire for them. For each of these two additional sources, we did a frequency count for the answers we obtained and grouped them in frequency order, as indication of which practices appeared to be more helpful. We then pulled together all the above information from the three sources to provide clues about the most helpful practices, which could be compared with the availability and accessibility of those practices, thus answering the focal question of “how well”.
Besides the above two main themes, we definitely wanted to gather comments and suggestions about the program from new and experienced teachers, since the comments and suggestions could not only render information on how well the program was functioning, but also provide good ideas for maintaining, adjusting, or improving program practices. Questions used purposely to elicit the teachers’ comments and suggestions appeared in both the interviews with new teachers (Questions # 3 and 5 in Appendix E) and the focus group of experienced teachers (Questions # 3, 4, and 5 in Appendix F). But some comments and suggestions also emerged when the new teachers were answering question # 2 during the interviews, and when the experienced teachers were answering questions # 1 and 2 during the focus group. After a careful examination of all these comments and suggestions collected from the above sources, we found that they were largely specific recommendations for the program. Thus we grouped all these recommendations into one large category, and then organized them by topics.

When analyzing the remaining data which did not tie in directly to the above three main themes, we delineated three other themes which we thought were peripherally connected to the focal evaluation questions. These themes were status of the current program practices; overall degree of satisfaction with the current practices; and the most needed information for incoming teachers. First, the implementation status of the current program practices became clear from the data, mainly through the interview with the administrators (Question # 2 in Appendix D) and the interviews with the new teachers (Question # 1 in Appendix E). This information could show whether the current practices were happening and in what variations they were happening. Next, overall degree of satisfaction with the program emerged from the data in the interview with the administrators (Question # 3 in Appendix D) and in the interviews with the new teachers (Question # 2 in Appendix E). How satisfied the administrators and the new teachers were with
the current practices could give us some general idea of how well the program was doing its job. Last, the most needed information by incoming new teachers appeared in the data from the questionnaire for the incoming new teachers (Question # 2 in Appendix G). This could be compared with what was in place in the program to see whether the current practices were meeting the incoming teachers’ knowledge needs.

With the completion of the analysis of the data for the six themes listed above, the data from all the sources had been exhausted, with no more important and relevant information for the focal evaluation questions. In the evaluation findings section below, I will present and describe the findings about each of these six themes in detail, and explain from the findings any answers, insights, or understandings we gained about the focal evaluation questions.

**Evaluation Findings**

**Intended/ Desired Outcomes of the Program, Achieved or Not**

The interview with the ELI Executive Director and the Director produced what they, as ELI administrators, saw as the intended outcomes of the pre-semester induction program for new teachers. Please see Table 2 below for the results. Note that these intended outcomes touched on the very basics new teachers needed to achieve at the overall institution level (the ELI) and at the course level (the specific courses they were to teach). Five out of the seven intended outcomes (# 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7) were what new teachers should achieve at the overall institution level; while the other two intended outcomes (# 2 and 3) were what to be achieved at the course level. In addition, qualifiers like “overall”, “surface-level”, “preliminary”, and “a sense of” appeared in the statements of the intended outcomes to be achieved at the institution level. The two outcomes at the course level (# 2 and 3) were the very basic knowledge and skill new teachers needed to
develop about the course: knowing what the course goals and objectives were; and being able to
draw course syllabus confidently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: ELI Administrators – intended outcomes of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through the pre-semester induction, an ELI new teacher will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Get an overall picture of the ELI, including its mission, student population, curriculum areas, language policy and etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Feel confident in making the syllabus for the course he or she is to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Become familiar with the goals and objectives of the course he or she is to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Acquire surface-level knowledge of the administrative duties of the ELI teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Develop a preliminary sense of ownership of being part of the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Get a sense of the ELI as a work environment where administrators, lead teachers, and colleagues are approachable and supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Get to know the resources that teachers can make use of for their teaching (e.g., ELI Online Resource Room, equipment and etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The wording of the intended outcomes is based on what the administrators produced during the interview, and was confirmed with the administrators both during the interview and after the interview.

The experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester also articulated what they saw as the desired outcomes of the program during the focus group session. Please see Table 3 below for the results, grouped into course-level outcomes and institution-level outcomes. Note that there were far more desired outcomes to be achieved at the course level (10 out of 15) than the ones to be achieved at the overall institution level (5 out of 15). The desired outcomes at the course level touched on the concrete knowledge and understanding new teachers needed to develop about the course, including its goals and objectives, projects, lesson plans, teaching materials, and the connections among these course elements, as well as teacher autonomy, tips and suggestions from experienced teachers, and some basic terminology.
Table 3: Experienced ELI teachers – desired outcomes of the program

*Through the pre-semester induction, it is desirable that an ELI new teacher will, at the course level.*
- Know the goals and objectives of the course he or she is to teach
- Know how 70 and 80 level courses (including ELI 100) differ in terms of the goals, objectives, teaching materials, and course projects
- Understand the connection between course goals/objectives and the design of course projects and lesson plans
- Have an idea of how the course materials are translated into actual lessons
- Have an idea of what actual lesson plans look like and how they are used
- Understand what the course projects really mean and how to do the projects
- Know which course projects are required and which ones are optional (Listening/speaking curriculum and Reading curriculum)
- Have a clear idea of how much autonomy teachers can have in constructing the course (e.g., in choosing alternative teaching approaches, and in using alternative textbook and course projects)
- Get to know the experiences and suggestions lead teacher and other experienced teachers have for teaching the course
- Understand some basic terms like needs analysis and diagnostic activity

*at the institution level.*
- Know the ELI curriculum and its approaches
- Know the student population
- Know the attitudes ELI teachers are encouraged to take towards students
- Know the roles of lead teachers in the curriculum area, especially their availability to new teachers
- Become clear of some policies like attendance policy, exemption policy, and the use of interim report

Note: The desired outcomes are a summary of what the teachers produced when answering the question during the focus group.

A comparison of Tables 2 and 3 shows that there was a certain discrepancy between what the ELI administrators and the experienced ELI teachers saw as needed by incoming new teachers through the pre-semester induction program. While the intended outcomes specified by the administrators were rather basic with minimal knowledge, skill, and senses that new teachers needed to achieve, the desired outcomes articulated by the experienced teachers were quite specific with concrete knowledge and understanding that new teachers needed to develop, particularly at the course level. A number of specific outcomes to be achieved at the course level
appeared in the desired outcomes articulated by the experienced teachers, most of which were not evident in the intended outcomes of the program. These differences showed that the experienced teachers thought that there were a number of important elements about ELI courses that incoming new teachers needed to get to know, while the administrators did not see these course-specific knowledge and understanding as the intended outcomes of the teacher induction program. This was an indication that the intended outcomes of the program underestimated what the incoming new teachers actually needed. With these intended outcomes, it was thus questionable whether what was in place in the teacher induction program could adequately address the teachers’ needs, and thus help them to prepare for teaching.

Moving to the question of whether the intended outcomes (Table 2) were being achieved, perception data were obtained from the ELI administrators and the new teachers of Spring 2006 semester. One of the administrators expressed in the interview that he/she could not be confident about the intended outcomes being achieved because of institutional constraints such as uncertainties brought by using GAs as instructors.

When the three new teachers were asked during the interviews whether they were able to achieve the points outlined in Table 2, all three teachers felt that they were able to achieve 1), 3), 4), and 7). However, all three new teachers expressed certain concerns about achieving 2), that is, feeling confident in making the syllabus for an ELI course. One of the new teachers did not feel confident in making both the syllabus and calendar, since he/she was not sure what to add to the syllabus and the calendar, particularly about what projects to do and what the projects should look like. Another new teacher felt the syllabus was not hard to put together, but was not confident in making the course calendar. The third new teacher had a hard time in using the pre-set and non-negotiable goals and objectives on the syllabus, which seemed inconsistent with
his/her philosophy of a critical participatory approach to pedagogy. For intended outcome 5), one of the new teachers felt that he/she was able to develop a preliminary sense of ownership before the semester started. The other two new teachers did not feel they were able to develop that sense of ownership. One of them mentioned that he/she did not develop a good sense of being part of the ELI until one or two months later, after he/she started to teach. The other one felt that ELI teachers were rather isolated from each other, and there were few opportunities for them to communicate. For intended outcome 6), one of the new teachers already felt that all the ELI staff were approachable and supportive before he/she started to teach. The other two new teachers felt that the ELI administrators and lead teachers were very approachable and supportive, but did not feel that all the other teaching colleagues were also approachable. In sum, based on these three teachers’ perceptions, intended outcomes 1), 3), 4), and 7) were achieved, and intended outcomes 2), 5), and 6) may not have been achieved. The pre-semester induction program they went through facilitated these teachers in achieving some of the intended outcomes, but not the others, thus having helped them to prepare to teach only to a certain extent.

As for the desired outcomes of the program suggested by the experienced ELI teachers during the focus group (Table 3), experienced teachers were asked how well they thought the outcomes were achieved in their personal experiences of the pre-semester induction process. No answers were obtained from them in regard to this question. Two reasons might explain the non-response. First, the teachers might have felt awkward to answer the question in the group discussion, since different teachers might have different answers to the question. Second, some of the outcomes were suggested when the teachers reflected on their personal experience and wished that they had achieved the outcomes. Therefore, it was unclear how well the pre-semester induction program was able to help incoming new teachers to achieve these desired outcomes,
especially given that these outcomes reflected what they needed in order to get ready for teaching.

To sum up the above findings, compared with the desired program outcomes perceived by experienced teachers, it seemed that the intended program outcomes the administrators had in mind underestimated what the incoming new teachers actually needed, especially at the course level. It was questionable, with these intended outcomes, whether the program practices would adequately address the teachers’ needs and help them to prepare for teaching. However, it was reported by the new teachers of Spring 2006 semester that they were able to achieve some of the intended program outcomes but not the others in their experiences. As for the desired outcomes perceived by the experienced teachers, it was not clear whether incoming new teachers were able to achieve them through the teacher-induction program.

Status of Current Practices for the Program

One result of the preceding evaluation processes was the conceptualization of a more full-fledged and accurate picture of what the current pre-semester induction practices included and their current implementation status, mainly through the interview and follow-up talks with the administrators, and the interviews with new GAs of Spring 2006 semester. Please refer to Table 4 below for details. The table shows that many of the current practices had a clear status of being required or being suggested but not required, but a few practices did not have a regular or clear status at the time of the evaluation. These unregulated or unclear practices were orientation meeting with the Coordinator, meeting with lead teacher, and curriculum area readings.
The interview data show that, for the three new GAs of Spring 2006 semester, all of them had a meeting with the lead teacher(s) to talk over course-related issues. None of them had an orientation meeting with the Coordinator or were given the curriculum area readings. Two of them had the chance to observe one or two ELI classes, and the third did not have a chance. To different degrees of detail, all of them read the Teacher’s Manual and previewed the textbook and other teaching materials (including online resource room) on their own. One of them had some discussion with the teachers after observing their classes. Another new teacher initiated a lot of discussions with ELI teachers in informal situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Practices</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Suggested but Not Required</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job interview</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Director</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>not regular yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Lead Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrators were unsure whether it should be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to ELI teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dependent on individual new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI Teacher’s Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI website</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum area readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes given to new teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing textbook/ teaching materials (including online resource room)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-ELI meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when initiated by a SLS student, the ELI administrators, or SLS faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interview data show that, for the three new GAs of Spring 2006 semester, all of them had a meeting with the lead teacher(s) to talk over course-related issues. None of them had an orientation meeting with the Coordinator or were given the curriculum area readings. Two of them had the chance to observe one or two ELI classes, and the third did not have a chance. To different degrees of detail, all of them read the Teacher’s Manual and previewed the textbook and other teaching materials (including online resource room) on their own. One of them had some discussion with the teachers after observing their classes. Another new teacher initiated a lot of discussions with ELI teachers in informal situations.
Overall Degree of Satisfaction with Current Practices

Through the interviews, some overall idea was obtained of how satisfied the ELI administrators and the new teachers were with the current practices.

The ELI administrators commented that the current pre-semester induction practices worked adequately to get the new teachers through into the first week of their teaching. They pointed out that, while current practices aimed for the highest possible standards, due to institutional constraints and limited resources (at the College level and indeed throughout the entire university, which was seriously underfunded), it was unlikely that it would be possible always to achieve excellence in every area. One of the administrators also mentioned that they could not frontload everything, and there was no need to frontload everything since the ELI human structure supported continuous development for new teachers and the ELI had high-quality people as teachers.

The three new ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester were asked, during the interviews, how well they thought the pre-semester practices prepared them for teaching in the ELI. One of them rated the pre-semester practices as average in preparing him/her for the teaching. Another new teacher thought he/she was well-prepared through the pre-semester process. The third new teacher did not provide a direct answer to the question, only commenting on what was very helpful and what made things difficult for his/her preparedness. Please note that each of the three new teachers experienced different pre-semester practices and had different teaching and educational backgrounds prior to entering the ELI.

The Most Helpful Pre-semester Practices for New Teachers, Accessible or not

The interviews with current new teachers, the focus group with experienced teachers, and the questionnaire for incoming new teachers all sought to identify what they perceived as the
most helpful pre-semester practices for new teachers. Table 5 shows which pre-semester practices the three new teachers of Spring 2006 semester thought to be particularly helpful to them. These practices came from their responses to open-ended questions. Table 6 shows the result of the short questionnaire (Appendix F) about the helpfulness of the current practices, which was used during the focus group with the experienced teachers of Spring 2006 semester. Table 7 shows the most important things the incoming new teachers of Fall 2006 semester would like to do or wish to do in order to be prepared to teach in the ELI. These practices came from their responses to open-ended questions.

Table 5: The most helpful practices for new ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Most Helpful Practices</th>
<th>N of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with lead teacher(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading materials on the ORR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to ELI teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First CAM at the all-ELI meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher’s Manual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N of teachers = 3
ORR = Online Resource Room; CAM = Curriculum Area Meeting

Table 6: The helpfulness of current practices perceived by experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Helpfulness of Current Practices</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with lead teacher(s)</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to ELI teachers</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing textbook/teaching materials (including ORR)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with ELI Administrators</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI website</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher's Manual</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum area readings</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-ELI meeting</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N of teachers = 11; ORR = Online Resource Room
1= Not helpful; 2= Not so helpful; 3= Helpful; 4= Very Helpful
Table 7: The most needed practices by incoming ELI new teachers for Fall 2006 semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Most Needed Practices</th>
<th>N of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting and talking to ELI teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing textbook/ teaching materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Internship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI teacher orientation catalogue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending a teacher-training workshop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing a little research to get familiar with academic English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N of teachers = 5

The three sets of data consistently show that “Observing ELI classes”, and “Meeting and talking to lead teacher and other ELI teachers” were perceived by teachers as the most helpful pre-semester practices for ELI new teachers. In addition, from the focus group data with experienced ELI teachers of the spring 2006 semester, “Internship”, “Previewing textbook/teaching materials (including ORR)”, and “Orientation meeting with ELI administrators” were also perceived as quite helpful pre-semester practices for new teachers.

A few quotes from the interview data and the questionnaire data will be helpful here as concrete illustrations of some of these key findings. When one of the new teachers of the spring 2006 semester was talking about the pre-semester practices that were particularly helpful to him/her, he/she pointed out “probably a combination of observation, and meeting with teachers and lead teachers” and commented that “If you observe different classes, and if you talk with different teachers, and then if you talk with lead teacher, that helps a lot.” One of the incoming new teachers of the fall 2006 semester wrote an additional comment in the questionnaire as follows: “I think a thorough orientation and plenty of chances to observe others' courses is the most important. What courses you would teach and the material (book) that you would use
should be handed out to the new teacher in advance to fully prepare for the courses they would teach.”

Although all of these most helpful and quite helpful practices were available in the program, it remained in question how accessible they were to the incoming new teachers. When compared with the status of current practices, the most helpful practices did not appear to be entirely accessible. “Observing ELI classes” was suggested but not required; the administrators were unsure whether “meeting with lead teacher” should be a required practice; and “talking to ELI teachers” was largely dependent on individual teachers. The current program had not made the most helpful practices as accessible as possible to incoming new teachers.

The Most Needed Information by Incoming New Teachers of Fall 2006 Semester

The result of the questionnaire for incoming new teachers of Fall 2006 semester shows the most important information they felt necessary to know more about before beginning to teach in the ELI. Please see Table 8 for the detailed results. These items came from their responses to open-ended questions. Several of the core elements included student population, textbook/teaching materials, course syllabus and schedule, tips/advice from experienced ELI teachers, and class size. Please note that the results can only constitute one piece of information for what a new ELI teacher actually needs to know, but they do show what is on the minds of incoming new teachers.
Table 8: The most needed information by incoming new teachers of Fall 2006 semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Most Needed Information</th>
<th>N of Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student population</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook/teaching materials</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course syllabus and schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tips/advice from experienced ELI teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class size</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties or hardships a new teacher may face</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation from the ELI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected level of English competency from a NNS instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much we should/can stick to a basic curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to test/grade each student</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time can I expect to work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to negotiate the possibly conflicting students’, teachers’ and program’s needs or wants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total N of teachers = 5

In terms of whether the most needed information was provided by the program, it seemed that the information about the core elements identified above was available in the program. However, it remained in question whether the most needed information was prioritized and delivered to incoming new teachers efficiently. It was also unclear here what specifics the new teachers needed to know about the core elements identified above and whether the information about the specifics was available and easily accessible. For example, what exactly the new teachers needed to know about the textbook/teaching materials was unclear here, and whether they could easily and efficiently access that information was still a question. In addition, Table 8 shows that individual new teachers may have their unique information needs. It then raised the question of how well the program was addressing those individual differences in knowledge needs.
Specific Recommendations for the Program from New and Experienced ELI Teachers

During the interviews and focus group, new and experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester made a number of specific recommendations for the program to help new teachers to get prepared. The recommendations are listed in Table 9 below, grouped by topics. Most emphasized among these were: (a) making observing ELI classes more accessible and useful to new teachers, (b) requiring meeting with lead teacher(s) as part of the pre-semester induction practices, (c) making meeting and talking to other ELI teachers more accessible, (d) prioritizing the information on the Teacher’s Manual for new teachers to read, (e) adding more detailed information about the course projects and activities to the Online Resource Room, (f) having annotated lessons plans available on the Online Resource Room, and (g) having meetings/workshops where teachers discuss course projects, activities, and lesson plans.

Table 9: Specific recommendations for the program from new and experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observing ELI classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Videotape a typical/regular class for each of the ELI curriculum areas, and put them up on the online resource room; **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Justifications: - The classes that incoming new teachers can observe at the very end of a semester are usually non-typical classes; - Experienced teachers may get requests from quite several new teachers at the same time; – Putting them online makes them more accessible.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decisions for hiring new teachers should be made earlier so that they will have more chances to observe classes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Encourage DSLS students who plan to apply for GAship in the ELI to observe ELI classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting with lead teacher(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- It should be a required practice for pre-semester induction for new teachers; **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Specify what to be covered during the meeting with the lead teacher which everyone in the curriculum area finds most useful for a new teacher to know about teaching the course;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lead teachers could go over the annotated syllabi, calendars and course projects with new teachers when meeting them;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make clear to new teachers what lead teachers are all about and the fact that they are accessible, and approachable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9: Specific recommendations for the program from new and experienced ELI teachers of Spring 2006 semester - Continued

**Meeting and talking to other ELI teachers**
- Makeclear to new teachers that, besides lead teacher(s), other ELI teachers are also available and approachable;
- Decisions for hiring new teachers should be made earlier so that they will have more chances to talk to other ELI teachers.

**Teacher’s Manual (TM)**
- Mark out in the TM the most important messages for new teachers to read; **
  (Justifications: – TM is too long, and the information is not prioritized to show which information is the most important for new teachers to know. – Some information on the TM does not meet new teachers’ most immediate needs and does not make much sense to them.)
- Make the TM content more concrete and easier to understand for new teachers, probably by providing examples;
- Place a hard copy of TM in each ELI office. Hard copies can be easier to use.

**Textbook/ teaching materials (including online resource room<ORR>)**
- Add more details about the course projects and activities in the handouts on the ORR, e.g., what they really are, the rationales for using them, and how to use them; **
- Have annotated lesson plans available on the ORR, instead of just teaching materials; **
- Let teachers have the textbooks and teaching materials well in advance;
- Prioritize the materials on the ORR for new teachers to read;
- Point out to new teachers which sections of the textbook to preview, that is, the ones that are more relevant to the course;
- Keep some books about second language teaching pedagogy in the Resource Room.

**Administrative procedures (by administrators, lead teachers, or other teachers)**
- Have meetings/ workshops where teachers can share ideas about course projects, activities, and lesson plans; **
- Let new teachers know which course to teach earlier, and avoid last-minute change;
- Ask new teachers to read certain sections of TM that are really important before the orientation meeting with the Director, so that they can prepare questions to ask and can have discussions during the orientation;
- Orientation meeting with the Director can be conducted with several new teachers together;
- Make clear to new teachers that syllabus and calendar can be given to students in the second week, and that making minor changes to syllabus and calendar later is okay;
- Let new teachers know the ELI intranet document;
- Have a new teacher share office with an experienced teacher in the same curriculum area;
- Make a pre-semester checklist for new teachers about what to do and what to know;
- Make internship more accessible;
- Have cross-curriculum meetings and gatherings;
- Update ELI website so that it can give accurate and concrete information to new teachers.

Note: The items with ** at the end are the ones that appeared in both the interview data and the focus group data or the ones that were mentioned by two new teachers during the interviews. The items without ** at the end were either mentioned only in the focus group session or mentioned by one new teacher during the interviews.
Table 9 shows that the ELI teachers had many suggestions and recommendations for the pre-semester induction program for new teachers. Their suggestions and recommendations should be taken into careful consideration when maintaining, revising, and improving the program practices, since they were the people who had experienced the program and who knew what would work and what would not work for helping new teachers to get ready for their teaching.

**Reporting of Evaluation Findings**

The evaluation findings were reported to the primary intended users, first in a working session with them, and then in a full evaluation report and an executive summary. In the working session, I presented the evaluation findings to the PIUs, and they asked for clarifications and interpreted what the findings meant and what actions to take from there. In the evaluation report, I also proposed three major ways of using the evaluation findings: (a) re-examining and re-thinking the program’s goals and objectives by comparing the intended outcomes administrators had in mind and the desired outcomes teachers suggested; (b) creating a system to make “Observing ELI classes” and “Meeting and talking to lead teacher and other ELI teachers” more accessible and useful to new teachers, since they were perceived by teachers as the most helpful practices; and (c) carefully considering the specific recommendations made by teachers (Table 9), particularly the ones that were most emphasized, and finding ways to use the recommendations. The PIUs then read the full evaluation report in careful detail, further asked for clarifications as needed, and had a meeting among themselves to discuss how to use the evaluation findings.
Uses of Evaluation Findings and Process

Upon completion of the evaluation activities, the primary intended users took immediate and active actions in using the evaluation findings, as they found them particularly useful. In Fall 2006 semester, the PIUs made a detailed action plan to use the evaluation findings, and implemented a number of program changes based on the findings:

- Meeting with curriculum lead teacher was ascertained to be a required pre-semester induction practice;
- Class observation was made a required pre-semester induction practice;
- Three ELI classes were video-taped and would be edited and used as an alternative to live classroom observation. Plans were made for more videotapes of classes in future semesters;
- Hiring decisions were made earlier to allow new teachers adequate time for observing classes and interacting with administrators and current teachers;
- The opportunity of volunteering/internship in the ELI was announced to DSLS graduate students (Note: there were a total of four interns in Fall 2006 semester);
- Prioritized sections on the Teacher’s Manual were highlighted for new teachers to read through. Teachers were asked to read them before the orientation meeting with the Director;
- Orientation meeting with the Curriculum Coordinator was made a required pre-semester induction practice;
- Efforts were made to re-arrange the materials and to fill out the gaps in the Online Resource Room to make it more useful and user-friendly to future teachers;
- As required end-of-semester submission from each teacher, an annotated syllabus was replaced by the options of annotated lesson plan, project, calendar, syllabus or a teaching reflection. These were then uploaded to the Online Resource Room;
- A new activity was used during the All-ELI meeting to help new teachers to prepare for teaching by getting veteran teachers’ advice and tips.

In Spring 2007 semester, in addition to continuing the above program changes, the PIUs designated me to make checklists for the pre-semester teacher induction program, to be used by
the ELI administrators, lead teachers, and new teachers. I then drafted these checklists (See Appendix H) based on the evaluation findings and the implemented program changes, in consultation with the ELI administrators and lead teachers. The checklists will be piloted in Spring 2007 semester, and further revised as needed. These checklists could thereafter serve as a mechanism for maintaining improved program practices and for developing a more cogent and systematic program.

In addition to the anticipated uses of the evaluation findings, several process uses occurred as the evaluation played out, although they were not explicitly planned. Process use “refers to and is indicated by individual changes in thinking and behavior, and program or organizational changes in procedures and culture, that occur among those involved in evaluation as a result of the learning that occurs during the evaluation process” (Patton, 1997, p. 90). For instance, through this evaluation, the administrators developed a better and more sophisticated understanding of what evaluation is, what good it can do to a program, and how it can possibly proceed. The ELI Director commented that, instead of the preconception of evaluation as collecting data, he could now “see how evaluation is connected to the evolution of the program”, and “understand the philosophy of how program evaluation can help our program to evolve in positive (proactive) ways” (K. Harsch, personal communication, March 16, 2007). In addition, during the evaluation process, the administrators gained increased understandings of the program. By specifying the intended outcomes of the program, the administrators started to seriously think about what the program was all about and what it was to accomplish. The ELI Director observed that the evaluation set him thinking more about what the administrators (the program providers) were doing, and how it would affect the teachers (the program recipients) (K. Harsch, personal communication, March 16, 2007). Last but not least, the evaluation empowered the ELI teachers
since their thoughts and ideas about the program were heard and highly valued, and their suggestions taken. The fact that the evaluation focus was proposed by two teachers out of our internal concerns added to the empowerment of teachers.

**Conclusion**

The report of this evaluation study aims at calling attention to uses of evaluation and showcasing the application of a utilization-focused approach (Patton, 1997) in language program evaluation. It is evident from this example that, with this approach, not only did the evaluation produce very useful findings, but the evaluation findings were used to develop and improve the program as intended, and the evaluation process was also useful in promoting positive program changes. Again, the key of utilization-focused evaluation is that it is “done for and with specific, intended primary users for specific, intended uses” (Patton, 1997, p. 23). In this evaluation study, the uses were built in from the very beginning by carefully identifying the primary intended users and negotiating with them the purposes and intended uses of the evaluation. The uses were made possible and maximized by working closely with the primary intended users throughout the evaluation process and having them as decision-makers for major evaluation components. The uses were further ensured by designing evaluation methods that pursued the pre-specified intended uses. Additionally, the uses were enhanced and localized by sensitizing to and responding to the specific program needs, characteristics, and situations. To conclude this long list of how uses were achieved in this study, I naturally ask for attention to and espouse the utilization-focused approach that the evaluation rested on. It is the approach that we should learn from and use, if we are to prioritize uses and utility in our evaluation efforts.
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Appendix A

Evaluation of the New-Teacher Training/Development Practices of the ELI
Initial Stage- Primary Intended Users and Intended Uses

This evaluation will target the new-teacher training/development practices of the ELI, and it will employ a utilization-focused approach (Patton, 1997). Weiwei Yang and Aki Iimuro, who are teachers at the ELI, will work collaboratively as internal evaluators, facilitating the evaluation process. Utilization-focused evaluation is “evaluation done for and with specific, intended primary users for specific, intended uses” (Patton, 1997, p. 23). Within the ELI program, we have identified the Executive Director, the Director, and the Coordinator for Curriculum and Teacher Development, as the primary intended users of this evaluation, since you are the administrators who will make decisions and take actions based on the evaluation process and results. In addition, since ELI teachers are major stakeholders for the evaluation and their ideas and opinions are always valued by you as administrators, we would like to propose the inclusion of one teacher representative as an additional primary intended user, who will join in the decision-making process throughout the evaluation.

The whole evaluation process will be facilitated by the two internal evaluators, who are responsible for drafting evaluation plans, executing the evaluation, and writing the evaluation reports. Each of the major procedures will be negotiated with the primary intended users who decide on what will happen through the evaluation (i.e., what the evaluation will accomplish); therefore, we will call upon you for your ongoing thoughts, comments, and priorities about the evaluation as it proceeds. As primary intended users, you will have the final decisions as to the intended uses, desired outcomes, content, methods, and final uses of the evaluation. Your direction shows your ownership of the evaluation, and will maximize the potential uses of the evaluation process and findings. In sum, the two internal evaluators will do the evaluation work, but decision-making will come from you.

At this initial stage, it is crucial to clarify the intended uses of the evaluation first and foremost. Instead of constituting a piece of research work, the evaluation process and findings shall be used by the program for its improvement, and the uses must be planned at the beginning of the evaluation. Based on our conversations and observations thus far, we anticipate that the primary intended uses of this evaluation are likely to include: 1) specifying what the new teacher
training/development practices are trying to accomplish, 2) finding out how well the current 
practices are able to meet new teachers’ needs and administrators’ expectations, 3) identifying 
specific areas for improvement and suggesting ways for improvement, and 4) forming a basis for 
implementing necessary changes for the improvement of new teacher development practices. In 
addition to, or in place of, these anticipated uses, you may have other priority uses for evaluation 
that you have identified, and we would like to hear more about those. Fundamentally, by 
specifying intended uses now, at the very beginning, we seek to enhance the utilization of the 
evaluation process and findings; as such, these intended uses that we agree upon will become the 
central guiding force for the evaluation.

Please go to http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=705651897077 to provide your 
thoughts and comments on this initial document on intended users and intended uses. It 
should require approximately 15 minutes. We will report your input and work towards 
group consensus. In the next step, we will move on to working out specific evaluation 
questions that will help us to meet these intended uses for the evaluation.
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Appendix B

Intended Users and Intended Uses Questionnaire

This survey serves as a means of having your thoughts and comments on the Evaluation Statement document. For this purpose, please provide your name and your answers to each of the questions. Completion of the survey should require approximately 15 minutes.

1. Your name

2. As a primary intended user, what do you see as the purpose(s) of the evaluation?

3. Please describe your perceived role as a primary intended user in the evaluation.

4. We have identified four potential uses of this evaluation. Please provide your opinions of the potential uses. Please choose N/A if the item does not make sense to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Use</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Specify what the new teacher development practices are trying to accomplish.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Find out how well the current new teacher development practices are able to meet new teachers’ needs and administrators’ expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Identify specific areas for improvement and suggest ways for improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Form a basis for implementing necessary changes for the improvement of new teacher development practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. If you have identified intended uses of the evaluation other than the ones listed in Q #4, please describe them below with a brief explanation.

6. Do you agree to the idea of including one teacher representative as one of the primary intended users who join in the decision-making process throughout the evaluation? Please provide your opinion of agree or disagree of having one teacher representative in the evaluation committee.

   Disagree ◆ Agree

7. If you would like to clarify your opinion on Q #6, please describe it below.

8. If have any additional thoughts and comments, or questions and concerns, about the Evaluation Statement document or the survey, please provide them below.

Thank you very much!
### Appendix C– Evaluation Plan & Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week/ Dates</th>
<th>Evaluation Activities</th>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Major Intended Uses</th>
<th>Internal Evaluators’ Roles</th>
<th>Primary Intended Users’ Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Week 13 4/ 10-14 | Interview             | ELI administrators              | Specifying what the pre-semester induction practices are trying to accomplish (the status quo and the administrators’ expectations) | 1) Designing the interview questions  
2) Conducting the interview  
3) Recording and reporting the interview | 1) Being the informants  
2) Checking over the interview questions to ensure the utility of the interview; Reading the report for confirmation |
| Week 14 4/ 17-21 | Interview             | New ELI teachers in Spring 2006 | Finding out how well the pre-semester induction practices were able to meet the new teachers’ needs | 1) Designing the interview questions  
2) Conducting the interviews  
3) Recording, analyzing and interpreting the interviews | Checking over the interview questions to ensure the utility of the interview |
| Week 15 4/ 24-28 | Focus Group           | Experienced ELI teachers in Spring 2006 | Finding out experienced ELI teachers’ perceptions, comments, and suggestions of pre-semester induction practices | 1) Designing the focus group questions  
2) Conducting the focus group  
3) Recording, analyzing and interpreting the focus group | Checking over the focus group questions to ensure the utility of the focus group |
| Week 15-16 4/24-5/5 | Questionnaire       | Incoming ELI teachers for Fall 2006 | Identifying incoming ELI teachers’ needs and expectations for pre-semester orientation/induction | 1) Designing the questionnaire  
2) Administering the questionnaire  
3) Recording, analyzing and interpreting the questionnaire | Checking over the questionnaire questions to ensure the utility of the questionnaire |
| Week 16-17 5/ 1-10 | Writing Final Evaluation Report |                             | Triangulating and reporting the evaluation findings; Identifying specific areas for improvement and suggesting ways for improvement | Writing the final evaluation report | Providing input on how you want the evaluation report to be written, constraints, formats, delivery options (e.g., presentation to ELI?) |
| Week 18-5/ 15- | Reading Final Evaluation Report |                             | Forming a basis for implementing necessary changes | Providing clarifications and elaborations if needed | 1) Reading the final evaluation report  
2) Implementing necessary changes |
Appendix D

Questions for the Interview with the ELI Administrators

Warm-up: Title of the program – new teacher training/development practices?
– pre-service trainings/orientations for ELI new teachers?

1. What are the intended outcomes of the pre-service trainings/orientations for ELI new teachers?
   i.e. What are the pre-service trainings/orientations for ELI new teachers trying to accomplish?
   i.e. What changes will ELI new teachers experience through the pre-service trainings/orientations, e.g., changes in their knowledge, abilities, and possibly dispositions?

2. Please provide confirmation about the current status (Required or Suggested but Not Required) of the pre-service trainings/orientations for ELI new teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Suggested but Not Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Director</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Coordinator</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with lead teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher’s Manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum area readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-ELI meeting</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Submitting lesson plans to Director for feedback</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>? Director reviewing grading &amp; record-keeping system</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent do you think each of the above processes are occurring to your satisfaction, and are achieving the outcomes you described in Q #1? What areas of uncertainty do you have for the processes and their intended outcomes? Which seems to need more attention?

+ For the interviews we are going to conduct with this semester’s new GAs, we aim at finding out how well the pre-service trainings/orientations were able to meet their needs. What are the main questions you want us to ask them?
Appendix E

Questions for the Interviews with New ELI Teachers of Spring 2006 Semester

1. Before you started to teach in the ELI, what kinds of pre-semester orientation did you receive from the ELI, and what kinds of pre-semester activities did you engage in on your own? (√ or ×) (Note: This Q is for schematizing purpose as well.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orientation meeting with Director</th>
<th>Reading ELI website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Coordinator</td>
<td>Curriculum area readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with lead teacher</td>
<td>Previewing textbook/teaching materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td>All-ELI meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher’s Manual</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Overall, how well do you think these pre-semester things were able to help you to get ready for the teaching tasks in the ELI?

3. 1) Of these pre-semester things, what (if anything) seemed to be particularly helpful/useful? Why? (Specific Q: If you had the pre-semester meeting with the lead teacher, how helpful do you think it was? Do you think it is something that all ELI new teachers should have as part of the pre-semester orientation?)

2) Of these pre-semester things, what (if anything) seemed to be not so helpful/useful? Why?

3) Did you feel you were overloaded with information during the pre-semester orientation? Were there any pre-semester orientation activities (or parts of activities) that you feel were completely unnecessary to prepare you to begin your first semester in the ELI? Why?

4) What seemed to be insufficient or lacking in the pre-semester orientation/induction process? Why? (Is there anything that you feel would have been very helpful for you, but you were not able to get from the pre-semester orientation?)

4. Through the pre-semester orientation/induction, were you able to
   - get an overall picture of the ELI, including its mission, student population, curriculum areas, language policy and etc.
   - feel confident in making the syllabus for the course you are to teach
   - become familiar with the goals and objectives of the course you are to teach
   - acquire surface-level knowledge of the administrative duties of the ELI teachers
   - develop a preliminary sense of ownership of being part of the institution
   - get a sense of the ELI as a work environment where administrators, lead teachers, and colleagues are approachable and supportive
   - get to know the resources that teachers can make use of for their teaching, e.g. ELI Online Resource Room, equipment and etc.

5. Overall, in your opinion, how can the pre-semester orientation/induction processes further improve in order to serve the new teachers’ needs better?
Appendix F

Questions for the Focus Group with Experienced ELI Teachers of Spring 2006 Semester

1. Through the pre-semester induction process, what knowledge, skills and maybe new dispositions do you think new ELI teachers should develop, so that they can be adequately prepared for the teaching tasks in the ELI? (+ Since most of us are international GAs teaching in this new educational and cultural context, do you feel that we have special needs that need to be addressed during the pre-semester process?)

2. Now take a minute to recall. Think back to your first semester of teaching in the ELI, overall, how well do you think the pre-semester things you received from the ELI and you engaged in on your own helped to achieve the elements identified in Q #1? Why so?

3. Everyone, now please take several minutes to fill out a short questionnaire (See next page) about how helpful you think the current pre-semester induction practices can be to a new teacher. After that, we will talk about the current practices as a group.

4. Now we will come back as a group to talk about your comments on the current pre-semester practices in helping new teachers. (+ Is there any other pre-semester activity you think the ELI could provide or encourage new teachers to do that would be very helpful to them?)

5. In what other ways (if anything) do you think the pre-semester induction practices can further improve to meet ELI new teachers’ needs better?
How helpful do YOU think the following pre-semester activities can be to ELI new teachers? Please provide your comments or suggestions for any of the activities you would like to give comment/suggestion on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not helpful</th>
<th>Not so helpful</th>
<th>Helpful</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Comments/ Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation meeting with Administrators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(about program issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Lead Teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(about curriculum area issues)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing ELI classes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to ELI teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI website</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading ELI Teacher’s Manual</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum area readings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing textbook/ teaching materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including online resource room)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-ELI meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Questionnaire for Incoming New ELI Teachers of Fall 2006 Semester

Welcome to the ELI!!

This questionnaire is distributed to all the new teachers joining the ELI this Fall. This questionnaire is part of a program evaluation project looking at pre-semester orientation/induction practices for new teachers in the ELI. Please help us with this questionnaire in order to best know your needs before teaching and to improve the new teacher orientation/induction practices of the ELI. Your input here will be valuable information for the evaluation, and will facilitate the ELI in meeting your needs better.

Completion of the questionnaire will take approximately 10 minutes. Please provide your answers to each of the questions. Your answers will be kept anonymous. Please provide your name so that we can keep track of who has responded.

1. Your name

2. Please briefly describe what you already know about the ELI, and through what means you developed the knowledge.

3. Suppose that you already know which ELI courses you are going to teach, what are the four most important things you feel necessary to know more about before you start to teach in the ELI?
   -
   -
   -
   -

4. If you have any more to add to the list, please add in the box below. If not, leave it blank.

5. Suppose that you already know which ELI courses you are going to teach, what are the four most important things that you would like to do or wish you could do in order to be more familiar with the ELI and to prepare yourself for teaching the course?
   -
   -
   -
   -

6. If you have any more to add to the list, please add in the box below. If not, leave it blank.

Thank you very much!
Appendix H

Checklists for Pre-semester New Teacher Induction

Director’s Checklist for Pre-semester New Teacher Induction

✓ Make announcement of volunteer opportunities in the ELI to DSLS graduate students in the new-student orientation, right before the start of each Fall semester; Clarify the purposes of volunteering.

✓ After hiring decisions (around Week 9), send an email to IGAs (Incoming GA) scheduling orientation meetings with them, and asking them to skim through selected sections on the Teacher’s Manual (TM) (Welcome to the ELI; About the ELI; GAships in the ELI; Teaching in the ELI; The Chronological Semester-the most immediate parts; Resources; FAQ-optional), and to come with questions if any. In the email, provide them with Online Resource Room’s (ORR) Username and Password, and instruct them about how to locate the TM on the ORR.

✓ For IGAs not on Oahu, send them an email asking them to skim selected TM sections, and telling them to email Director, Coordinator, or Lead Teacher (if applicable) if they have any questions. Find out their arrival date and set up an orientation meeting soon after their arrival.

✓ Have orientation meetings with IGAs:
  o Welcome the IGAs to the ELI! Point out Director’s role in the ELI, the ELI’s organizational structure, and Director’s and Coordinator’s open door policy.
  o Go through the TM, pointing out important points, answering IGAs’ questions and concerns, and engaging in discussions: Welcome to the ELI; About the ELI; GAships in the ELI; Teaching in the ELI; The Chronological Semester-the most immediate parts; Resources.
  o Emphasize the requirement of observing at least one ELI classes before the end of the semester (the earlier, the better; as many as possible). Encourage them to approach and talk to current ELI teachers.
  o Provide a tour of Moore 570 (meet secretaries; get paperwork started; & show mailboxes and office supplies located in the cabinet near the door).

✓ Inform IGAs of their teaching assignment, which includes curriculum area and course level, and lead teacher’s contact information.

✓ Inform lead teachers which IGAs are going to teach in their curriculum area, and ask them to arrange a meeting with the IGAs as early as possible prior to the All-ELI meeting (ideally, this could happen before or shortly after the end of the semester prior to the IGA’s first semester). For IGAs not on Oahu, ask lead teachers to email them about the important things of the curriculum and the course needed for preparation. Inform them of the need to meet soon after the IGA’s arrival.

✓ (With Coordinator) Conduct the All-ELI meeting, and introduce the IGAs to everyone.
Coordinator’s Checklist for Pre-semester New Teacher Induction

✓ After hiring decisions (around Week 9), send an email to the IGAs (Incoming GA):
  o Welcome them to the ELI!
  o Inform them that they are required to observe at least one ELI classes before the
    semester ends (the earlier, the better; as many as possible). For IGAs not on Oahu,
    ask them to observe online classes or to watch videotaped classes (if available).
  o Mention to IGAs that they should talk to the teachers whose classes they observed
    before or/and after the classes.
  o Encourage IGAs to talk to current ELI teachers.
  o Attach a list of ELI teachers’ names, courses and contact info.

✓ Send an email to all ELI teachers announcing and welcoming the IGAs (Cc the IGAs),
  and the possibility of the IGAs’ approaching them for class observations (requirement) or
  questions. Ask current teachers to be friendly and available, and encourage them to
  approach the IGAs and say ‘hello’ as well.

✓ Schedule an orientation meeting with the IGAs. Tell them the purpose/content of the
  meeting. Ask them to skim through curriculum/ teacher development sections of the
  Teacher’s Manual, and to browse around each curriculum area (listening/speaking;
  reading; writing) on the Online Resource Room (ORR), focusing especially (but not only)
  on the area they are most interested in and most likely to teach.

✓ For IGAs not on Oahu, send them an email asking them to browse around each
  curriculum area (listening/speaking; reading; writing) on the ORR, focusing especially
  (but not only) on the area they are most interested in and most likely to teach. Ask them
  to let Coordinator know which curriculum area and course they are most interested in
  teaching (remind them that, if they have not already done so, they should also let Director
  know). Find out their arrival date and set up an orientation meeting soon after their arrival.

✓ Have orientation meetings with IGAs:
  o Refer to “Coordinator's Orientation” file about the meeting content.
  o Provide a tour of the ELI Resource Room, the Equipment Room, and GA offices in
    Moore Hall, and provide IGAs with the access codes.

✓ When teaching assignments are finalized, encourage IGAs to talk to the teachers who are
  teaching the courses they are going to teach.

✓ Direct IGAs to the textbooks and other teaching materials for the courses they are to
  teach in the Resource Room.

✓ Plan an informal social gathering for all current teachers and IGAs around the end of the
  semester, if possible.

✓ (With Director) Conduct the All-ELI meeting, and introduce the IGAs to everyone.
Lead Teacher’s Checklist for Pre-semester New Teacher Induction

Note: This checklist is for an orientation (a.k.a. ‘induction’) designed for new teachers to the ELI. Please remember that you should also meet individually with veteran ELI teachers who are new to your curriculum area. Obviously, the content covered will be somewhat different.

After hearing from Director about an IGA (Incoming GA) who is to teach in your curriculum area, contact the IGA to welcome him/her and to make a meeting appointment. Ideally, the meeting could happen before or shortly after the end of the semester prior to that IGA’s first semester, no later than the All-ELI meeting. Ask the IGA to take a look at the latest syllabi and calendars of the course he/she is to teach on the Online Resource Room (ORR), and the textbooks, and to come to the meeting with any questions. For IGA not on Oahu, email him/her about the important things of the curriculum and the course needed for preparation. Inform the IGA of the need to meet soon after his/her arrival.

Email all teachers in your curriculum area (Cc the IGA), welcoming the IGA’s joining the curriculum area and encouraging the current teachers and the IGA to meet and talk to each other.

Have an orientation meeting with the IGA about the curriculum area and the course, before or shortly after the end of the semester prior to the one when the IGA will teach—depending on everyone’s schedule. But please use your best judgment to decide where and when each piece of information below can be most suitably covered (e.g., by email, individual meeting, first curriculum area meeting, or some combination).

- Welcome the IGA to the curriculum area! Inform them of your role as lead teacher in the curriculum area, especially as mentor/support to new teachers.
- Ask the IGA about his/her past teaching experience, and ask him/her what he/she expects teaching in an academic English program to be like. Elicit any questions about teaching in the curriculum area and teaching the course.
- Introduce the curriculum area in some detail, e.g. how many levels and what the basic differences of the levels are. Point out the curriculum philosophy and the level separation chart.
- Introduce the course(s) the IGA is to teach, including its:
  - goals and objectives
  - course projects (e.g., required or optional; what they mean; how they are usually used)
  - main assignments
  - key teaching and learning activities
  - textbooks (e.g., layout of the textbooks; suggestions of which chapters to use and how to use them; curriculum ≠ the textbook)
  - other important teaching materials
- Go through a couple of examples of the latest course syllabi and calendars. Point out the use of the syllabus template.
- Inform the IGA that the syllabus and calendar can be given to the students in the 2nd week, not necessarily the 1st class, and that minor changes on the syllabus and calendar later is possible.
- Point out the sections on the ORR that are of immediate use to the IGA.
- Share with the IGA your experience in teaching the course, e.g. tips, advice, suggestions, if applicable.
- Share with the IGA some common concerns about teaching in the curriculum area.
- Encourage the IGA to teach deeply instead of broadly; Discourage him/her from teaching teacher-fronted classes.
- Inform the IGA of other teachers in the curriculum area and encourage the IGA to talk to them, especially the teachers who are teaching the course the IGA is to teach. (These teachers may have useful tips and different perspectives to share.)
- Inform the IGA about monthly curriculum area meetings (CAM) and their purposes.
- Direct the IGA to the curriculum area readings for some literature related to the curriculum area.
- Advise the IGA of the basic preparation work before the semester starts, e.g., getting the syllabus and calendar ready, previewing the textbook and other important teaching materials, and previewing important materials on the ORR.
- Ask the IGA to submit to you the syllabus and calendar for review and feedback before the semester starts or earlier.
- Talk about the first two weeks of the semester- a bit “chaos”; not core students yet, etc.
- Advise the IGA of what to cover in those first couple of weeks- ice breaker/rapport building; student background information sheet; review of syllabus and calendar; diagnostics, etc.
- Explain the diagnostics (e.g., materials, procedure, how to interpret and use results).
- Prepare a schedule sheet for planning curriculum area meetings.
- Re-emphasize your role as lead teacher in the curriculum area. Make clear to the IGA your availability to him/her and how to best contact you.

✓ Review and give feedback on the IGA’s syllabus and calendar. Ask the IGA to bring a hard copy of the finalized syllabus and calendar to the first CAM in the All-ELI meeting.

✓ Conduct the first CAM in the All-ELI meeting and have everyone introduce themselves.
ALOHA & WELCOME TO THE ELI!

Checklist for New Teachers to the ELI

This checklist is a series of activities that you are required or encouraged to engage in BEFORE you start to teach in the ELI. These activities are intended to help you to become familiar with the ELI context and to prepare for your teaching. You will be contacted via email or other means about the details of these activities. Below is a brief description of what you can expect:

✧ **Orientation meeting with Director.** The ELI Director, will have an orientation meeting with you for a comprehensive overview about the ELI program. You will be asked to read a few sections of the ELI Teacher’s Manual ahead of the meeting.

✧ **Orientation meeting with Coordinator.** The ELI Coordinator will also have an orientation meeting with you, focusing on curriculum and teacher development aspects of the ELI. You will be asked to read related sections of the ELI Teacher’s Manual, and to browse around each curriculum area (listening/speaking; reading; writing) on the Online Resource Room ahead of the meeting.

✧ **Observing ELI classes.** You are required to observe at least one ELI classes during the semester prior to the one when you teach. But for your best benefits, you are encouraged to observe as many ELI classes as possible, the earlier the better. Please also be sure to talk to the teachers whose classes you observe before or/and after the classes.

✧ **Talking to current ELI teachers.** Please feel free to approach any current ELI teachers should you have any question or need any information, tips or suggestions. They are all more than willing to talk to you, and to share with you their experiences and insights.

✧ **Informing Director and Coordinator of your teaching preference.** After you have figured out which curriculum area(s) and which course(s) you are most interested in teaching, please be sure to let Director and Coordinator know, so that they could take your preference into consideration when making teaching assignments.

✧ **Getting textbooks from Coordinator.** When teaching assignment is finalized, Coordinator will inform you how to get the textbooks and other teaching materials for the course you are to teach.

✧ **Meeting with the curriculum area lead teacher.** The lead teacher for the curriculum area you are going to teach will have a meeting with you regarding the details about the curriculum area and the course(s) you are to teach. You will be asked to take a look at the latest syllabi and calendars of the course(s) you are to teach on the Online Resource Room and to skim the content the textbooks before the meeting.

✧ **Browsing curriculum area readings.** The curriculum area lead teacher will give you a packet of readings related to the curriculum area. Please browse them as they could
provide you with some background knowledge about teaching in the curriculum area.

✧ **Submitting syllabus and calendar to lead teacher.** After you have drafted the syllabus and calendar for the course you are to teach, please submit them to the curriculum area lead teacher for review and feedback.

✧ **Doing other necessary preparatory work.** It is then your decision to engage in other preparatory work you deem as necessary. Some of them may include previewing textbooks and other teaching materials, previewing important materials on the Online Resource Room, preparing for the lessons for the first several weeks, and etc.

✧ **Attending the All-ELI meeting.** The All-ELI meeting takes place a few days before the new semester starts, during the placement test period. You will meet everyone in the ELI and will also have the first curriculum area meeting.

✧ **Feeling free to approach the ELI administrators, or current ELI teachers, if you need ANYTHING!!**