



Theses and Dissertations

2010-03-12

The Foundations Prep Course for Low Proficiency Students at Brigham Young University's English Language Center

Jessica H. McGovern
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Linguistics Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

McGovern, Jessica H., "The Foundations Prep Course for Low Proficiency Students at Brigham Young University's English Language Center" (2010). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2076.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/2076>

This Selected Project is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

The Foundations Prep Course for Low Proficiency

Students at Brigham Young University's

English Language Center

Jessica Lynn Holst McGovern

A selected project submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Dr. Norman Evans
Dr. Dee Gardner
Dr. Dan P. Dewey

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Brigham Young University

April 2010

ABSTRACT

The Foundations Prep Course for Low Proficiency

Students at Brigham Young University's

English Language Center

Jessica Lynn Holst McGovern

Department of Linguistics and English Language

Master of Arts

At the beginning of each term, a handful of students who are linguistically unable to function in an English-speaking classroom appear at the doors of intensive English language programs across the globe. The English Language Center (ELC) at Brigham Young University (BYU) is no exception. In the recent past, five to twelve students have arrived each semester inadequately prepared for the lowest level class available. When placed in that level (Level One), these so-called "Level Zero" students have had trouble progressing and have also delayed the progress of the entire class. Without intervention, these students can continue to lag behind and pull down the level of the class throughout their time at the ELC. Finding or creating a solution to this ongoing problem was the purpose of this project.

The solution presented here is to develop and implement a new curriculum designed specifically for these students. This course of action presents its own challenges, such as ensuring cost-effectiveness, providing adequate staffing, and finding or creating appropriate course materials. Each of these challenges has been addressed.

Cost effectiveness and adequate staffing are ensured by utilizing unpaid interns from the BYU undergraduate TESOL minor program as teachers, and paying only one experienced teacher who functions as a supervisor and a teacher as needed. Course materials, some only recently developed, were chosen for the All Skills Class, the Vocabulary Class, the Reading Class, and the Lab Class. These classes currently constitute the Foundations Prep Course.

The need for this curriculum was reiterated during a needs analysis conducted Winter Semester of 2009 by the students of the BYU Linguistics 677 (Curriculum Development) class. The Foundations Prep curriculum was then developed by the author during the summer of 2009 and implemented by her the following semester at the ELC. It is again being utilized there Winter Semester 2010.

Institutional and financial feasibility, progress of students, reactions of members of the Executive Council, of the Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor, and of the interns, have all been examined to aid in considering the efficacy of continuing this program into the future.

Keywords: curriculum development, English language learners, intensive English language programs, low proficiency students

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would first of all like to express gratitude to my Heavenly Father for His guidance and direction each step of the way, in my entering, continuing, and completing this Master's program. Without His help, comfort, assurance, and direction, nothing would have been accomplished that has been accomplished.

I am grateful to my husband for his loving support. I am convinced that no husband has ever done more dishes, laundry, grocery shopping, and babysitting of grandchildren. I also thank my 93-year-old mother in Minneapolis for her constant and efficacious prayers.

I am grateful to my fellow classmates of the Winter Semester 2009 Linguistics 677 class for contributing to the inception of the idea to create a Foundations Prep Course Study, and particularly to Nick David and Marisa Ontiveros for suggesting that we offer teaching opportunities in the program to the 496R interns.

No one has been more involved and supportive than Dr. Norman Evans, my Project Chair, Curriculum Director of the ELC, and "Guide on the Side" of the Linguistics 677 class. To him I express gratitude for his steady watch care and amazing example and insights.

I thank Dr. Gardner for his superb example as a writer, and for his attention to detail. Many times as I was writing I held myself to a higher standard because I knew he would be reading my paper. I also thank Dr. Dewey for his support and helpful input. I thank all three members of my committee for their instruction in classes over the last few years and for their friendship and support.

Table of Contents

Context.....	1
Description of the Process: The ADDIE Model	1
Analysis of Needs – Winter 2009	2
Design – Winter 2009	3
Development – Summer 2009	3
Description of Classes.....	5
Exploring and Choosing Materials	6
Materials for the All Skills Class	7
Materials for the Vocabulary Class.....	8
Correlation of Vocabulary in <i>Touchstone</i> and the <i>Heinle Picture Dictionary</i>	10
Materials for the Reading Class.....	10
Materials for the Lab Class	12
The Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor	13
The Interns	14
Lines of reporting.....	15
Implementation – Fall 2009	15
Evaluation of Outcomes.....	16
Outcomes for Foundations Prep Students.....	17
Outcomes for Individual Students – Fall Semester 2009.....	17
Outcomes for the English Language Center	20
Outcomes for the Interns.....	21
Outcomes for the Linguistics and English Language Department	22
Implications for the Future.....	23
Conclusions.....	24
References.....	26
Appendix A: Goals and Objectives – Arranged by Skill Area	27
Appendix B: Content: Topics from <i>Touchstone</i> , Level One	32
Appendix C: Materials	33
Appendix D: Vocabulary Topic Comparison – <i>Touchstone</i> and Picture Dictionary.....	35
Appendix E: Recycling of Vocabulary in Graded Readers	36
Appendix F: Development – Hours	38
Appendix G: Development – Notes from Interviews	43
Appendix H: Development – Class Schedule – Fall 2009.....	49
Appendix I: Student Questionnaire – End of Fall Semester 2009	51
Appendix J: Intern Questionnaire – End of Fall Semester 2009	53
Appendix K: Fall Semester 2009 Interns.....	55
Appendix L: Schedules for Winter Semester 2010 Interns	57

Context

For a number of years preceding Fall Semester of 2009, the English Language Center (the ELC) at Brigham Young University (BYU) had offered five levels of English classes. Level One was designed to meet the needs of those with only a rudimentary knowledge of and skill in the language. Throughout subsequent levels a student's knowledge and skill were expected to develop until, upon completion of Level Five, a student was presumed to be ready for university-level work in English. A decision was made to change this system by developing two programs of three levels each: the English Foundations Program (consisting of Foundations Levels A, B, and C) and the Academic English Program (consisting of Academic Levels A, B, and C). The assignment was given to me and my fellow students of the 2009 Winter Semester Linguistics 677 class (Curriculum Development) by Dr. Norman Evans, our professor, to conduct a needs analysis of the students, the teachers, and the institution, and subsequently, based on the findings of this analysis, to design the curriculum for Levels A, B, and C of the Foundations Program. The curriculum for the Academic Program had previously been designed and developed by the Executive Council and members of the Curriculum Committee.

Description of the Process: The ADDIE Model

The ADDIE model, a “generic, systematic approach to the instructional design process,” (L:\htms\training\handouts\pf_files\addie.docdoc) served as a guide for the fulfillment of the 677 class assignment. It will also serve as a guide for the description of this Foundations Prep project. In the ADDIE model, the “A” stands for Analysis of needs, the first “D” stands for Design, the second “D” for Development, the “I” for Implementation, and the “E” for Evaluation.

Analysis of Needs – Winter 2009

As dictated by the ADDIE model, fulfillment of the 677 class assignment began with a needs analysis. During the process of conducting the needs analysis and designing the Foundations curriculum, it was noted that some students come to the ELC each semester who do not have even a rudimentary knowledge of, or skill level in, the English language. Because these students were not prepared to function in an English-speaking classroom, their needs were not being addressed by either the current or the proposed programs.

One possible solution to this problem that was discussed in class is to attempt to prevent inadequately prepared students from being accepted into the program by requiring entry tests. Unfortunately this method is ineffective since there is currently no way to guarantee global test security. This is also unacceptable because it means turning away students who are willing and otherwise able to enter the program.

A decision was made to address the needs of these students by adding a preparatory class to the curriculum to be designed and developed specifically to meet the needs of these “Level Zero” students. It would be called The Foundations Prep Course. It consists of an All Skills Class, a Vocabulary Class, a Reading Class, and a Lab Class. The Lab Class utilizes a keyboarding program and Level One of the *Rosetta Stone* program. The classes are taught by undergraduate interns who are supervised by a more experienced Teacher/Supervisor.

The 677 students concluded, after conducting various surveys and interviews of Executive Council members and teachers, that the greatest need of these students was to learn a large amount of vocabulary in a short amount of time. Another issue often discussed in class was the need for individual and ongoing help with pronunciation. Of course, in addition, the

need remains for these students, as for all second language students, to establish or improve their skills in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and to improve their knowledge of grammar.

Design – Winter 2009

During Winter Semester of 2009, my fellow students of the 677 class and I conceived of a course where the lowest proficiency students would be placed together and feel comfortable, where they would be enabled to progress at their own level without feeling inadequate, and where they would no longer impede the progress of other students. Classes would be aimed specifically to fulfill their needs, especially their great need for large amounts of basic vocabulary. Instructional objectives would be written for each skill area and element of language learning. Materials would be at a lower level than the Foundations A materials, and would be designed and/or chosen especially for the lowest proficiency students.

There would be one paid teacher/supervisor and the rest of the responsibilities for the course (i.e. teaching, tutoring and proctoring) would be carried out by undergraduate interns from the TESOL 496R class. The goal of this course would be for the students to solidly qualify for and be prepared to function in all classes in Foundations Level A by the end of their semester in Foundations Prep.

Development – Summer 2009

From the beginning of April through the end of August, 2009, I spent more than 170 hours in meetings, interviews, brainstorming, writing goals and objectives, organizing, researching materials, and pilot teaching, in order to develop the curriculum for the Foundations Prep Course as it currently stands. (See Appendix F for a chart of the hours spent.)

Interviews were conducted with the ELC Coordinator, the Director of Curriculum and Test Development, the Technology and Assessment Coordinator, the Administrative Executive

Secretary, and the six members of the Executive Council who were then called Skill Area Coordinators. Dr. Norman Evans, also a member of the Executive Council and the Associate Coordinator for Curriculum at the ELC, was an integral part of the process, being the chair of the MA committee for this project. Also interviewed were: an experienced Lab Technician, a fellow MA student who was familiar with the Linguistics and English Language Department's intern program and the *Touchstone* materials, and a fellow MA student who was in the process of developing the Academic Prep Course for the ELC. In these interviews, I was looking for ideas about how the course might be organized, what is most essential for low proficiency students to learn, what kinds of materials might be the most effective, suggestions for possible computer programs, texts and readers, and days and times that some of the ELC facilities might be underused.

All of these interviews helped me understand the needs of the Prep students and how to ensure that the program would harmonize with the ELC as an institution. For example, I learned what class and office space was available, what books and materials were already owned by the ELC, and that lab space during class time was at a premium. I was introduced to the graded reader series which was eventually chosen for the reading class. Computer programs were suggested to me that I could explore. All of those interviewed agreed that vocabulary was the greatest need for these students. (See Appendix G for notes from most of these interviews.)

Goals and Objectives were written keeping in mind the pattern set by the writers of the Goals and Objectives for the Foundations and Academic programs, as well as the particular needs of these low proficiency students. (See Appendix A for full text of Goals and Objectives. See ELC website, www.elc.byu.edu, for Goals and Objectives for Foundations Levels A, B, and C and for Academic Levels A, B, and C.)

Description of Classes

As noted above, the Foundations Prep Course consists of an All Skills Class, a Vocabulary Class, a Reading Class, and a Lab Class. The inclusion of a vocabulary class and a lab class in the Foundations Prep curriculum left no room in the school day to have a separate class for each skill as there had been in the past at the ELC. An integrated skills class was chosen in order to cover more skills in less class time. It was originally called the “Integrated Skills Class,” but the name was changed to the “All Skills Class” to make it more easily pronounced and understood by the Prep students. This class addresses grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, conversation strategies, listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Because of the multitude of resources available with the textbook chosen for this class, it was determined that it would be a 90-minute class.

Since vocabulary acquisition was deemed to be the greatest need of these low proficiency students, the decision was made to include an entire class devoted to the study of vocabulary. The 65-minute Vocabulary Class provides a concentrated exposure to, processing of, and recycling of large amounts of basic vocabulary.

The skill of reading was deemed to be important enough at this level to warrant its own class. The 65-minute Reading Class begins with picture-based readers which include pronunciation, spelling, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing exercises (all essential elements), and later incorporates out-of-class reading and in-class discussion of graded readers.

The 60-minute Lab Class uses a typing program to help the students develop their keyboarding skills (essential to their eventual success at the ELC or beyond), and uses Level One of the *Rosetta Stone* program to contribute to the improvement of their pronunciation, listening, speaking, reading, writing, automaticity, and knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. Held

every day, it is conducted after normal ELC classroom hours in order to decrease the class-time load on the limited lab space available. Since this means that Prep students stay later in the day than other ELC students, they have been scheduled to arrive an hour later in the morning. (See Appendix H for a sample class schedule.)

A Writing Class, not mentioned above, was not part of the original curriculum. It was added to the curriculum the second semester for two reasons. First, feedback on a questionnaire from the initial semester Prep students (see Appendix I) suggested a writing class might be helpful. And second, more interns needed assignments. This class is simply an extension of the All Skills Class because it helps to further develop the writing assignments introduced there.

Exploring and Choosing Materials

Much exploration preceded final decisions on the materials to be used in each class. I first searched the ELC's Resource Library and Self-Access Study Center (the SASC), and then scrutinized the catalogs and web sites of all major ESL publishers. Members of the 677 class who went to the TESOL conference during the semester perused materials on display there and brought many samples back for the rest of us to examine.

All decisions about materials were based on four major considerations. The first was that they be pedagogically sound, in other words, that they followed the principles for teaching beginning levels delineated by H. Douglas Brown (2001, pp. 98-103). Some of these principles are to engage in plenty of repetition, emphasize both accuracy and fluency, have group and pair activities that are structured and clearly defined, and begin with an inductive approach to grammar with many examples.

The second was that they be at the correct level. This was judged based on my own past experience with low proficiency students. I looked at the materials and tried to imagine using

them with the many low proficiency students I have taught. For the graded reader series, level was judged by the number of headwords in each volume.

The other two requirements stemmed from the fact that we planned to use undergraduate interns as teachers. This meant that the materials had to have clear, easy-to-follow instructions to the teacher, and be accompanied by adequate supporting materials.

The All Skills Class utilizes Level 1 of the *Touchstone* series by Cambridge. The Vocabulary Class makes use of the *Heinle Picture Dictionary* and related resources. The Reading Class uses the *True Stories* series by Pearson Longman, and graded readers from the *Thomson Foundations Reading Library*. The Lab Class consists of the *All the Right Type* keyboarding program, and Level 1 of the *Rosetta Stone* program. The Writing Class expands on the writing assignments found in Level One of the *Touchstone* series. (See Appendix C for a more detailed listing of materials.)

Materials for the All Skills Class

Level One of the *Touchstone* series closely follows the guidelines for teaching beginning levels outlined by Brown (2001) which were delineated above. It directs the teachers and students to engage in plenty of repetition and emphasizes both accuracy and fluency. Many group and pair activities are suggested that are structured and clearly defined, and it uses an inductive approach to grammar with many examples.

Before making the final decision to adopt the *Touchstone* materials for the All Skills Class, a week-long unit was piloted with the Summer Semester 2009 Level One Reading Class into which all of the Level Zero students had been placed for that semester. The conclusion from this pilot test was that the book was at the correct level for these students and had very clear instructions which would make it easy for novice teachers to use. In fact, Helen Sandiford, one

of the authors of the series, stated in a personal communication that *Touchstone* is specifically designed so that relatively inexperienced teachers can be successful in teaching it.

This series has many supporting materials including a Teacher's Edition with clear instructions to the teacher for every page of text in the Student's Book. The Teacher's Edition also includes ideas for how to check workbook answers in class, language notes (grammar), and language summaries (vocabulary) for each unit, self study listening activities for the students, and a complete testing program. There are more resources available in this series than in any other I have seen, making it conducive to being taught by interns who have little experience in developing their own materials. (See Appendix C for a complete list of *Touchstone* materials.)

One more factor contributed to this choice. The vocabulary, the conversation strategies, and the dialogs in this book are all based on a corpus developed by Cambridge of more than 700 million words. I am aware of no other textbook with this feature.

The content for the Foundations Prep Program is dictated by the topics in this *Touchstone* Level One textbook. Some of these topics are introductions, thanking people, classroom objects and instructions, apologizing, everyday life, neighborhoods, and shopping. (See Appendix B for a complete list of the topics.)

Materials for the Vocabulary Class

There are many vocabulary textbooks available for learning words from the Academic Word List, but I found none that covered the basic vocabulary needed by Prep students, except for picture dictionaries. A picture dictionary seemed like a wise choice because of the large amount of essential vocabulary treated (numbers, time, calendar, money, colors, prepositions, school, family, people, community, housing, food, clothing, transportation, health, work, etc.) and also

because of the possibility of using it as a self-study tool and reference resource beyond the time when it is used in this class.

After examining picture dictionaries published by several companies, The *Heinle Picture Dictionary* and related materials were chosen for several reasons. First, it is the only picture dictionary which comes with an accompanying lesson planner and workbooks. These resources facilitate the teaching of the class by inexperienced interns. For each lesson, the Lesson Planner contains suggestions for three levels of classroom activities covering 60 to 90 minutes of class time; the lowest level is appropriate for this class. These activities include a warm-up, an introduction, various ways to present the unit vocabulary, practice activities, ways to evaluate learning, and suggestions for practical application of what has been learned. The workbook comes with a CD, to be used with the listening exercises in the workbook.

Another reason for choosing The *Heinle Picture Dictionary* is that it was developed based on current research, which supports the idea that vocabulary is most effectively learned through exposure that is repeated and varied (Anderson, 1999; Nation, 2001) while using a strategic approach (Taylor, Graves, van den Broek, 2000).

The *Heinle Picture Dictionary* is organized into 16 thematic units. Each lesson within those 16 units consists of a two-page spread made up of a word list and corresponding illustration(s) and/or photograph(s) that illustrate the words. As they are unique to this dictionary, the following three additional elements, included on each two-page layout, also reinforced the decision. *Words in Context* is a short reading introducing vocabulary from the lesson in context. *Words in Action* suggests multi-skill activities which encourage practice of and give reinforcement to the vocabulary. This feature provides some of the repetition suggested by Brown (2001). The *Word Partnerships* section points out common high-frequency collocations

using words from the word list. This feature encourages the learning of “chunks” of language, viewed by Nation (2001) to be “the basis of language learning and use” (p. 321). Unfortunately there are currently no accompanying quizzes or tests available with this book.

Correlation of Vocabulary in *Touchstone* and the *Heinle Picture Dictionary*

Paul Nation (2001) concurs with Brown as to the importance of frequent repetition of target vocabulary items, stating that it “adds to the quality of knowledge and also to the quantity or strength of this knowledge” (p. 76). In order to contribute to this repetition, as well as to lighten the overall cognitive load placed on the Prep students, the vocabulary topics for the All Skills Class and the Vocabulary Class were correlated. The *Touchstone* lessons build on each other, and thus must be taught in their presented order. This is not required for the units in the picture dictionary. Therefore, the picture dictionary units were re-ordered to roughly match the timing of the topics of the *Touchstone* units (see Appendix D).

It was suggested that this type of correlation could also be done with the materials used in the Reading Class. This would be a complex undertaking and was deemed to be outside the scope of the present MA project. It could be undertaken at some future time, perhaps by an Executive Council member in charge of the Prep programs or as a future MA project.

Materials for the Reading Class

Basic Reading Power, an intensive reading textbook from Longman Press, was my first choice for the Reading Class, because I had previously used it successfully with low proficiency students. However, this book was selected for the new Foundations A class at the ELC, and therefore, was unavailable to be used in Foundations Prep. If it ever becomes available, I would consider its incorporation into the Reading Class materials at that time. After exploring many

other possibilities, two book series were eventually chosen to be used in the Reading Class, an intensive reading series and a graded reader series.

The intensive reading series is the *True Stories* series from Pearson Longman, which I had also previously used successfully with low proficiency students. Each story in the book is true and captivating. The first two books in the series are described by the publisher as “picture-based first readers.” They are written in the present tense in extremely simple and concrete language. They are designed for “absolute beginners who are familiar with the Roman alphabet.” (This almost perfectly describes the Foundations Prep students. We have actually had two students so far who were barely familiar with the alphabet. They could recognize and loosely pronounce the letters, but could not recite the alphabet in order.)

The books contain pre-reading, reading, and post-reading exercises. The pre-reading exercises consist of a drawing which introduces the theme of the story and facilitates the teaching of essential vocabulary. The students are prompted to recall knowledge and experiences that will help them understand the story. The reading exercises consist of looking at a series of pictures while the teacher reads, then looking at the words under each picture while the teacher reads, and finally, the students read the story themselves. The post-reading exercises include pronunciation, spelling, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing exercises, and suggestions for discussion.

A 20-unit third book in the series is described as “a picture-based beginning reader,” rather than a “first” reader. Still written primarily in the present tense, it contains the same types of exercises as the first two books. A 22-unit fourth book is no longer picture-based and is described simply as a “beginning reader.” It contains the same exercises, with vocabulary and structure still carefully controlled. The series continues into more advanced levels, but so far

only the first three books have been used in this class. Class sets of these books were already previously owned by the ELC and are loaned to the Prep students each semester.

All graded readers currently on hand in the SASC, as well as graded readers from Heinle, Cambridge, Oxford, and Pearson-Longman were considered before choosing the *Thomson Foundations Reading Library* of graded readers. These were actually chosen at first simply because of the level at which they were written. This was the first series available at a low enough level for Foundations Prep students (although other publishers now seem to be following suit). This series begins at 75 headwords and gradually increases to 350 headwords (see Appendix C). Information obtained from one of the authors of the series through the publisher informs us that the core vocabulary at each level is generously recycled from level to level. This improves the odds that students will remember the words they have processed (See, for example, Nation, 2001). (Appendix E contains data from the publisher on how many words are recycled at each level.)

Materials for the Lab Class

A keyboarding program was deemed necessary because there seemed to be general consensus among those interviewed that the less familiarity a student had with English, the less familiarity that student would have with computers (see especially Lab Technician interview in Appendix G). This seems to have been borne out so far with the students from the two semesters the program has been in existence. Those with the lowest proficiency have been found to be the least familiar with computers.

The primary reason for choosing *All the Right Type* as the keyboarding program was that it was already installed on the ELC computers, and would, therefore, incur no additional cost. Before making the final decision, members of the Executive Council and a number of current

teachers were consulted. All agreed it was an acceptable program. I had also had personal experience with it as an ELC Level Three Writing teacher and found it to be useful. Students use this program during approximately half of the lab time.

The *Rosetta Stone* program was chosen to be used during the second half of the Lab Class after exploring other possible programs such as *Imagine Learning*, *lexialearning.com*, *livemocha.com*, *Reading Horizons*, and *Softread*. It was chosen because it works on all the skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) as well as aspects (vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation) of language learning. The frequent repetition advocated by Brown (2001) and Nation (2001) are required in the *Rosetta Stone* program. This encourages automaticity as well as “chunk” learning of high frequency collocations (see Nation, 2001).

Brown (2001) also emphasizes the importance of pronunciation work at beginning stages. He states, “Neglecting phonological practice now may be at the expense of later fluency” (p. 201). The method of dealing with pronunciation in the *Rosetta Stone* program provides for individual attention to each student’s pronunciation without requiring one-on-one teacher attention. Headphones with a microphone are used and the students’ pronunciation of specific words or phrases is compared technologically to a standard. Students cannot advance to the next step in the program until their pronunciation for each word or phrase comes close to the standard. The level demanded can be changed to match the student’s current capabilities. Individual coaching can also be offered by the lab teacher from time to time as needed.

The Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor

The Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor is the only paid employee in the program. He/she recruits, interviews, and selects interns before the semester begins; sees that materials are ordered and disbursed in a timely manner; organizes the teaching and tutoring schedules;

supervises interns throughout the semester, holding regular individual and group meetings, conducting classroom observations and feedback sessions, and giving ongoing assistance in lesson planning, test writing, grading, and classroom management. He/she is also ultimately responsible for seeing that ELC policies for dress, attendance, grading, and use of materials and facilities are carried out appropriately by the interns. He/she fulfills only supervisory responsibilities during those semesters in which there are adequate interns to teach all classes. When fewer interns are available, he/she teaches a class in addition to functioning in a supervisory role.

Richards (2001) suggests several ways of supporting teachers in a language program. His suggestions include orientation, adequate materials, division of responsibilities, further training, mentors, feedback, rewards, help lines, and regular review of the program (pp. 221 – 214). The responsibility for providing this support falls on the Teacher/Supervisor in the Foundations Prep program.

The Interns

Undergraduate BYU students enrolled in the Linguistics 496R TESOL Academic Internship class function as unpaid teachers, tutors, and test proctors for the Foundations Prep Course. Before applying as interns they are required to complete three classes: English Language 223 “Introduction to English Language,” Linguistics 441 “Language Acquisition in TESOL,” and Linguistics 477 “Methods and Strategies in TESOL.” They are interviewed, screened, and then assigned to their classes and other responsibilities by the Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor. (See Appendices K and L to see intern assignments for Fall Semester 2009 and Winter Semester 2010 respectively.) Interns are required to contribute 150 hours of service

in the field in order to graduate from BYU with a minor in TESOL. (See the end of Appendix L for an example of how one intern will likely spend those 150 hours.)

Lines of reporting

For Fall Semester 2009 and Winter Semester 2010, I have served as the Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor. As such, I have reported from time to time to my Project Chair, Dr. Norman Evans, who is also the Associate Coordinator for Curriculum at the ELC. I have asked for opinions, help, and approval from various other sources (the Administrative Executive Secretary, the director of Curriculum and Test Development, the Technology and Assessment Coordinator, and the Operations Manager) as I deemed it necessary. However, in reality, I have functioned quite independently, making many decisions on my own.

Because the Foundations Prep Program is quite distinct from the Foundations Program in schedule and in the types of classes and teachers it has, and because supervising the three levels of the Foundations Program is quite a heavy load on its own, I would suggest that it might be useful to have the Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor report to a member of the Executive Council who is not involved in the supervision of Foundations or Academic classes. This Executive Council member might be specifically appointed to oversee only the classes and running of the Foundations Prep program along with other responsibilities not related to specific classes. Another possibility might be to have a member of the Executive Council actually function as the Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor.

Implementation – Fall 2009

The Foundations Prep Course was implemented at BYU's English Language Center Fall Semester of 2009. The initial class consisted of five students, each having scored at the "zero" level in at least some areas on their entrance exams. I served as the Teacher/Supervisor for that

semester, and taught the All Skills class. Six undergraduate interns taught the other three classes and served as test proctors and tutors.

Several steps were taken during the implementation of the program to facilitate procedures for these students whose lack of proficiency causes them difficulty in functioning in any English-speaking environment. First of all, I sent all students emails in their L1, welcoming them and explaining the first day of class to them.

I arranged through the Administrative Executive Secretary to have all of their classes (except the Lab and Writing Classes) located in the same classroom (Room 350). The Teacher/Supervisor and all of the interns have the same office which is close to the classroom (Room 354). This means that during the first days when their stress level is high and their proficiency level low, they have little need to ask for directions.

Likewise, in order to simplify the process of acquiring books, the ELC purchases the Foundations Prep books and holds them in the main office. The teacher of each class brings the students down to the office as a group during class time of the first week to purchase or check out the needed books, thus avoiding the necessity of navigating the BYU campus and bookstore. In addition, rather than having to take their tests in the ELC Testing Center with strangers as proctors, interns serve as test proctors and Friday tests are given in the same classroom where classes are held.

Evaluation of Outcomes

The desired goal of the Foundations Prep Course is to prepare students to function productively in each of the Foundations A classes. This outcome, which appears to have been achieved, as well as a number of other outcomes for students in general, for the individual Fall

2009 students, for the English Language Center, for the interns, and for the Linguistics and English Language Department, are described below.

Outcomes for Foundations Prep Students

- In general, the students enrolled in the Foundations Prep Course experience the advantage of a curriculum designed specifically for them at their level. Their fears are alleviated the first day of class when they realize that they will be able to function in this environment, probably in contrast to their previous experience during the ELC orientation process.
- Depending on the number of interns involved each semester, there can be almost unlimited opportunities for these students to receive tutoring.
- They have the opportunity to gain the knowledge and skills they need to qualify for Foundations Level A. Some students (primarily those with higher incoming scores) have the possibility of qualifying for Level B.
- The ELC requires students to be in Foundations Level B before they can be gainfully employed. Not qualifying for Level A in the current semester postpones this opportunity for Foundations Prep students. For some, this can constitute a financial burden.
- The students, in spite of their disappointment at not having qualified for a higher level, have expressed satisfaction with their learning experience in Foundations Prep, both orally to me, and in a questionnaire administered at the end of the semester (see next section for more about the questionnaire).

Outcomes for Individual Students – Fall Semester 2009

There were five students in the first semester of the program. In pre-semester placement tests, three students received conglomerate scores of “zero” (meaning unprepared for

Foundations A) in both the productive and receptive skills, while two received conglomerate scores of “one” (ready for Foundations A) in the productive skills and “zero” in the receptive skills.

At the end of the semester, one of those five students tested into Foundations Level B; three tested solidly into Foundations Level A; and one, who missed three weeks of class, did not qualify for Level A. Her preliminary diagnostic scores were the lowest in the class, and her motivation was low as she was pregnant and did not intend to continue her studies at the ELC the following semester. The student who advanced to Level B had the highest incoming scores, meaning that the Foundations Prep program at the very least maintained that student’s incoming advantage. One of the three students who tested into A at the end of fall semester was advanced into Level B by his teachers during the first week of winter semester. Thus, the end result for the four students who continued at the ELC was that two students advanced to Foundations Level B and two students advanced to Foundations Level A. Each of the two students in Level B have expressed to me orally that they are very comfortable there. They both say that they understand everything in class and the assignments are not too difficult for them.

A grammar diagnostic test obtained from the Technology and Assessment Coordinator, which had previously been given to Level One ELC students during the first week of class, was administered to these students both at the beginning (September 9, 2009) and at the end (December 8, 2009) of the semester. This 39-question test covers basic grammar, such as the present and past tenses of *be* and other common verbs, some irregular past tense verbs, the present continuous tense, question formation, question words, subject and object pronouns, some high frequency prepositions, frequency adverbs, articles, and the demonstratives *this, that, these,*

and *those*. Teaching during the semester was not specifically directed toward this test. Table 1 indicates the students' progress by comparing the pre-test to the post-test results.

Table 1

Results of Grammar Diagnostic Pre-test and Post-test, Fall Semester 2009

Student	<u>Pre-test % correct</u>	<u>Post-test % correct</u>	<u>% Improvement</u>
Student #1 (tested into Level A)	76.9	94.8	17.9
Student #2 (tested into Level A)	74.3	84.6	10.3
Student #3 (tested into Level B)	71.7	97.4	25.7
Student #4 (advanced into Level B)	71.7	92.3	20.6
Student #5 (did not return)	35.8	56.4	20.6

The smallest gain experienced was 10.3 percentage points and the largest was 25.7 percentage points. Even the student at the bottom of the class, who was absent a great deal and less motivated, managed a gain of 20.6 percentage points. These numbers demonstrate notable gains in grammar knowledge for all of the students in this class.

A questionnaire was administered to the students at the end of the semester because I wanted them to put in writing the comments they had been making to me concerning their reaction to the classes, the materials, and their teachers. In all of the responses, the only suggestion for improvement was to include a writing class. No comments were negative, while many were positive. Some examples are: "It were materials super good, because everything were a big help for learn English . . . I liked everything." "Rosetta Stone was a big program that helped me for practice a lot of topics that I learned in my classes." "My tutor helped and encouraged me. If I didn't have tutor, I may couldn't follow in class." "Thank you teacher Mrs.

MaGovern, and the others teachers for your help. You are wonderful teachers, thank you so much!” (Further responses are included in Appendix I.)

Outcomes for the English Language Center

- In the ELC’s online application form (available at www.elc.byu.edu) it now states:
“There is no lower limit in English proficiency required for admission.” This means that it is less likely that potential applicants will decide not to come to the ELC because of lack of confidence in their own English language skills. This can be especially important during the current global economic situation.
- Student populations in other levels will be more homogeneous without the lower proficiency students pulling them down, thus allowing classes in those levels to move more quickly and efficiently through their particular courses of study. This could increase the quality of education for all levels of the Foundations Program.
- Cost effectiveness and adequate staffing is ensured by utilizing unpaid interns and paying only a Teacher/Supervisor each semester.
- Utilizing interns as tutors and test proctors lightens the load on the ELC tutoring and test proctoring staff, also contributing to cost effectiveness.
- The presence of the interns at the ELC means that their services are used in other ways as well. For example, during Winter Semester 2010, one intern helped Dr. Evans with a research project, and Prep interns are tutoring Foundations A students in addition to tutoring Prep students.
- Overall, in spite of a one-time outlay of funds to purchase some new teacher materials and computer software (ten licenses were purchased for *Rosetta Stone*, Version 3, Level

1 at a cost of \$2,570), the Foundations Prep Course appears to be a resource-wise, as well as a pedagogically successful endeavor for the English Language Center.

Outcomes for the Interns

- This is the first time BYU interns have had the opportunity to serve in a teaching capacity at the ELC. Prior to Fall Semester 2009, they spent their 150 required intern hours in other schools and institutions in the community. They appreciate having more of a connection between their classes and their experience as interns, as well as serving in a location that is so close to campus.
- Interns involved in the Foundations Prep program acquire some experiences most undergraduate students do not have. They are able to stand in front of a classroom face to face with actual international second language students. They gain the “experiential knowledge” which offers them “opportunities for trying out and testing received knowledge” (Day, 1992). They observe, are observed by, and receive feedback from a more experienced teacher as described in Day’s “apprentice-expert model” of Second Language Teacher Education (Day, 1992).
- Those interns who subsequently enter the TESOL Graduate Certificate program at BYU (a number of them have applied or intend to apply) have the advantage of prior familiarity with the ELC, its staff, policies, and facilities.

A questionnaire was administered at the end of the semester to the interns who served during fall semester in order to learn about their final impressions of the program and perhaps be able to improve the program because of their experience. They expressed appreciation for the opportunity and spoke of many things they had learned, such as how long it takes to prepare good lessons, how to improve their classroom management skills, to always have a backup plan,

to double-check for comprehension, and to speak slowly and repeat a lot at this level. Their complete responses can be found in Appendix J.

One intern, who taught the Reading Class fall semester, told me that she and her mother had discussed her Foundations Prep intern experience at the end of the semester. She said they had come to the conclusion that this was either one of the best, or even possibly *the* best experience she had ever had in her life.

Outcomes for the Linguistics and English Language Department

- Interns are able to have an “in-house” experience, rather than going to multiple venues around the county. This facilitates communication and possibly even some control between the department and the interns’ supervisor.
- Since the undergraduate students are functioning in a real ESL venue, professors could give authentic assignments to their students in which they experiment with the concepts they are learning in their TESOL classes, giving them “experiential” knowledge in addition to the “acquired or received” knowledge they glean from their classes (Day, 1992).
- During Fall Semester 2009, six interns were able to experience meaningful positions at the ELC. During Winter Semester 2010, eleven interns are having that opportunity. Over the coming years, many more interns could have meaningful experiences with high learning impact as did the reading intern from fall semester.
- Overall, there is a clearer connection between the ELC and the Linguistics and English Language Department, thus strengthening the rationale for the existence of the ELC.

Implications for the Future

The Foundations Prep program offers some possibilities for future projects which could be carried out by graduate students as MA projects, or by members of the Executive Council. Some of these might be: an in-depth evaluation of the curriculum and outcomes, including formative, illuminative, and summative evaluations (Richards, 2001); development of tests and additional support materials for the *Heinle Picture Dictionary*, the *True Stories* series, and the graded readers; correlation of Reading Class materials with Touchstone topics; development of training materials for interns; development of instructions for the Teacher/Supervisor; and vocabulary analysis across the curriculum.

Since the process of making changes in higher education is an “evolutionary one,” and necessarily involves “an element of trial and error” and “tinkering,” (Evans & Henrichsen, 2008), it can be assumed that as time passes, some adjustments will inevitably be required in the Foundations Prep Course at Brigham Young University’s English Language Center. One incremental change has already been made in the program: adding the writing class in response to student feedback and availability of interns.

It is my belief that this program fills a real need that has existed for a long time and will continue to exist in intensive English language programs, and that it has enough positive features and positive outcomes for all stake holders to make it worth the effort to adjust it as needed, and keep it as a permanent feature of the ELC’s educational system. There also seems to be some potential for this program to reach beyond the ELC to be replicated in similar contexts in other locations, such as intensive English language programs on university campuses both in and outside of the United States, community ESL classes, and classes taught by missionaries of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints in many parts of the world.

Conclusions

From the beginning of my involvement in the TESOL field, I have had a special interest in low proficiency students. When I taught ESL (probably rather poorly) in the Dixon Middle School Community program in 2004 and 2005, I taught the earliest beginners because no one else wanted to. I loved it. I seemed to be able to communicate well with them. Their need for the language and their desire to learn it is great, and I wanted to help them find their way through the maze of unfamiliar sounds and words and structures that constitute language. I find it delightful that progress is so noticeable at this level, a phenomenon mentioned by both Brown (2001) and Snow, (2005). Both teacher and students always marvel at the end of a term at what has been accomplished.

I also have a strong interest in the English Language Center. I believe that it serves a great educational and conciliatory purpose in the world today. From here students return to locations all over the globe, taking with them a potentially life-changing knowledge of the English language, and a familiarity with Americans, “Mormons,” and the LDS church which they could receive in no other way. I believe their impressions are overwhelmingly positive in nature. From the beginning of my association with the ELC, I have wished to be able to contribute in a meaningful way to the fulfillment of its goals and purposes in the world and on this campus.

It delights me that, through this MA project, I have been able to serve the needs of the low proficiency students who come to this institution from all over the world, provide a unique and meaningful experience to undergraduate interns, and contribute in an educational and even a financial way to the institution itself. It has been especially satisfying to be directly involved with the implementation of my own project by serving as the Teacher/Supervisor for the first two

semesters of its existence. In comparison to my early teaching experience in the community, I have observed personal progress as a teacher that can be attributed to my participation in BYU's TESOL graduate program. Serving in a supervisory role has enabled me to build on leadership skills previously developed in church responsibilities. My understanding of how learning happens has deepened. My skill at ensuring that learning actually occurs has increased. Being involved in this process nourishes my soul. I wish to continue to be involved with it in some capacity into the future.

References

- Anderson, N.J. (1999). *Exploring second language reading. Issues and strategies*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Brown, H.D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy, 2nd edition*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Day, R.R. (1992). Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher education. *RELC Anthology Series*, 30, 38-48.
- Evans, N., & Henrichsen, L. (2008). Long-term strategic incrementalism: an approach and a model for bringing about change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 33(2), 111 – 124.
- Nation, I.S.P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Richards, J.C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. New York: Cambridge.
- Snow, D. (2005). *More than a native speaker, 2nd edition*. Bloomington, Illinois: TESOL.
- Taylor, B.M., Graves, M.F., & van den Broek, P. (2000). *Reading for meaning: fostering comprehension in the middle grades. language and literacy series..* New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix A: Goals and Objectives – Arranged by Skill Area

Overview: The Foundations Prep Course includes a 90-minute All Skills class, a 65-minute Vocabulary class, a 65-minute Reading class, and a 60-minute Lab class (30 minutes of keyboarding practice and 30 minutes of *Rosetta Stone* Level 1) for a total of 280 minutes in class each day, Monday through Thursday. When possible, there is also an optional writing lab three days a week to supplement the writing portion of the All Skills Class. On Friday, there is an additional 60-minute *Rosetta Stone* Lab class.

Level Goal: The Foundations Prep course provides students with the skills needed to function productively in each of the Foundations A classes.

Foundations Prep Vocabulary

Vocabulary Goal: Foundations Prep students learn sufficient vocabulary to transition to Foundations A classes.

Description: Foundations Prep students receive a “flood” of incidental and/or intentional vocabulary learning in each of their four classes. In three of their classes they also experience the use of various basic level vocabulary-learning strategies. Vocabulary units in the Vocabulary class are ordered to correlate with the vocabulary found in the All Skills class corpus-based textbook to reduce cognitive load on the learners and provide recycling of target vocabulary.

All Skills Class Vocabulary

Experiential Objectives:

1. Students hear and read the vocabulary incidental to the lessons of the current textbook.
2. They speak and write the words inside and outside of class.
3. They carry out the written strategy-learning exercises included in the current textbook.

Details: Vocabulary-learning strategies included are learning chunks, making diagrams, drawing pictures, learning collocations, linking, writing sentences, making notes on verbs, time charts, labeling, and grouping.

Reading Class Vocabulary

Experiential Objectives:

1. Students hear and read the vocabulary incidental to the lessons of the current textbooks. They write the words inside and outside of class.
2. They carry out the vocabulary exercises in the current textbooks.
3. Students read level-appropriate graded readers at least two hours per week outside of class. (Details on graded readers are included under Reading Objectives.)

Vocabulary Class Vocabulary

Experiential Objectives:

1. In class, students participate in communicative activities involving target vocabulary.

2. Outside of class, students participate in one-on-one communicative activities involving target vocabulary.
3. Students maintain vocabulary notebooks organized by parts of speech, and are instructed in the preparation and use of flash cards.

Vocabulary Class Vocabulary

Performance Objective:

Students match meanings to words of 80% of target vocabulary.

Rosetta Stone Vocabulary

Experiential Objective:

Students are repeatedly exposed to basic vocabulary utilized in the Rosetta Stone Lab class.

Rosetta Stone Vocabulary

Performance Objective:

Students complete at least three units of the *Rosetta Stone* Level One program.

Foundations Prep Pronunciation

Pronunciation Goal: Foundations Prep students prepare to function in Foundations A classes by improving their pronunciation to a level that can be understood by a native speaker and by their classmates.

All Skills Class Pronunciation

Experiential Objectives:

1. Students listen to the pronunciation of native speakers on the CD and DVD accompanying the current textbook.
2. They speak the words and receive feedback from the teacher on their pronunciation.

Reading Class Pronunciation

Experiential Objectives:

1. Students carry out the pronunciation exercises found in the current textbooks.
2. They receive feedback from the teacher on their pronunciation.

Vocabulary Class Pronunciation

Experiential Objectives:

1. Students listen to the pronunciation on CD of all target words both inside and outside of class.
2. In class, they receive feedback on their pronunciation from the teacher.

Rosetta Stone Pronunciation

Performance Objective:

Students repeat words they hear into a microphone until the program accepts their pronunciation as sufficiently native-like.

Foundations Prep Grammar

Grammar Goal: Foundations Prep students produce level-appropriate grammatical structures sufficient to transition to Foundations A accuracy and structure classes.

*All Skills Class Grammar**Experiential Objective:*

Students hear explanations of level-appropriate grammatical structures.

*All Skills Class Grammar**Performance Objective:*

When presented with several choices on level-appropriate tests and quizzes, students select 90% correct grammatical options.

*Rosetta Stone Grammar**Experiential Objective:*

Students are exposed to many level-appropriate grammatical structures.

*Rosetta Stone Grammar**Performance Objective:*

Students make enough correct grammatical choices to pass at least three units of the *Rosetta Stone* Level One program.

Foundations Prep Listening

Listening Goal: Foundations Prep students increase their listening fluency sufficiently to transition to Foundations A Oral Communication classes.

*All Skills Class Listening**Experiential Objective:*

Students spend over one hour per week listening to conversations and pronunciation of target vocabulary on CD.

*All Skills Class Listening**Performance Objective:*

When presented with several choices on level-appropriate listening comprehension questions, students select 90% correct options.

*Vocabulary Class Listening**Experiential Objectives:*

1. Students spend over one hour per week listening to pronunciation of target vocabulary.
2. They participate in class discussions focused on target vocabulary.

*Rosetta Stone Listening**Experiential Objective:*

Students spend approximately three hours per week listening to the *Rosetta Stone* program.

Foundations Prep Speaking and Conversation Strategies

Speaking and Conversation Strategies Goal: Foundations Prep students produce level-appropriate speech (including the use of appropriate Conversation Strategies) enabling them to transition to Foundations A Oral Communication classes.

*All Skills Class Speaking**Experiential Objectives:*

1. Students spend at least 60 minutes per week in class performing level-appropriate speaking tasks related to weekly textbook topics.
2. They spend at least 30 minutes per week outside of class conversing with a tutor on related topics and tasks.
3. In class, students are exposed to level-appropriate Conversation Strategies.
4. They practice using these strategies both inside and outside of class.

*Reading Class Speaking**Experiential Objective:*

Students spend at least 60 minutes per week in class performing level-appropriate speaking tasks related to reading assignments.

*Vocabulary Class Speaking**Experiential Objective:*

Students spend at least 60 minutes per week in class performing level-appropriate speaking tasks related to target vocabulary.

*Rosetta Stone Speaking**Experiential Objective:*

Students spend at least 60 minutes per week in class performing level-appropriate speaking tasks required by the program.

Foundations Prep Reading

Reading Goal: Foundations Prep students read both intensively and extensively, thereby acquiring the reading skills and fluency necessary to transition to Foundations A Reading class.

*All Skills Class Reading**Experiential Objective:*

Students read level-appropriate reading passages (both silently and aloud) at least one hour per week in class.

*Reading Class Reading**Experiential Objectives:*

1. Students read level-appropriate reading passages (both silently and aloud) at least one hour per week in class.
2. They read level-appropriate graded readers for at least two hours per week outside of class.
3. They participate in class discussions pertaining to these readers.

Details: The graded readers contain from 75 headwords with 500 to 620 total words, to 350 headwords with 2,100 to 2,500 total words.

Foundations Prep Writing

Writing Goal: Foundations Prep students prepare for the Foundations A Writing and Structure class by improving their keyboarding skills and by performing writing tasks incidental to their Foundations Prep classes.

*All Skills Class Writing**Experiential Objective:*

Students write level-appropriate answers to constructed-answer questions in their student books and workbooks. When possible, they engage in additional writing tasks designed to supplement the assignments found in their books.

*Reading Class Writing**Experiential Objective:*

Students write level-appropriate answers to constructed-answer questions in their textbooks and on quizzes and tests.

*“All the Right Type” Writing**Experiential Objectives:*

1. Students spend at least two hours per week in class on the *All the Right Type* computer keyboarding program.
2. They discuss and adjust their rate and accuracy goals in weekly meetings with the lab instructor.

*Rosetta Stone Writing**Experiential Objective:*

Students complete the writing tasks included in the *Rosetta Stone* program.

Appendix B: Content: Topics from *Touchstone*, Level One

- All About You (introductions, thanking people, personal information)
- In Class (classroom objects, classroom instructions, apologizing)
- Favorite people (celebrities, personalities, friends and family)
- Everyday life (a typical morning, weekly routines, lifestyles)
- Free Time (activities, TV shows)
- Neighborhoods (describe a neighborhood, telling time, making suggestions, advertising)
- Out and About (weather, phone messages, sports, exercise)
- Shopping (clothes, prices, gifts, shopping habits)
- A Wide World (sightseeing information, countries, international foods, places and people)
- Busy Lives (ask for and give information about the recent past)
- Looking Back (talk about a vacation, tell a funny story)
- Fabulous Food (food likes and dislikes, eating habits, requests and offers, invitations, recommendations)

Appendix C: Materials

All Skills Class Materials

Touchstone Level 1 by Cambridge

- Teacher's Edition
 - Recordings for written quizzes and tests
 - Introduction for teachers
 - Description of course components
 - Description of structure and features in Student's Book
 - List of the top 500 spoken words in *Heinle's* corpus
 - Scope and sequence chart
 - Ideas for checking workbook answers
 - Step-by-step teaching notes with listening and speaking exercises for pairs and groups
 - Self-study listening activities
 - Extra homework ideas for each lesson
 - *Language Notes* that provide an overview of the language presented in each unit, as well as useful information from the Corpus on the frequency of lesson items
 - *Language Summaries* (word and phrase lists) for each unit
 - A written quiz with answer key for each unit
 - Two accumulative written tests (Units 1-6, and Units 7-12) with answer keys
 - An oral quiz for each unit with sample answers and a scoring guide
 - Oral tests with sample answers
 - Audio scripts for all listening activities and listening sections on tests and quizzes
 - The Workbook answer key
- Class Audio CDs - recordings of all dialogs in a variety of voices and accents
- Student's Book with Self-Study Audio CD/CDROM
- Workbook with two pages of follow-up activities for each lesson
- DVD and Video Resource Book
 - Photocopiable worksheets for before, during and after viewing
 - DVDs can be played with or without English subtitles
 - Reinforces the grammar and vocabulary taught in each unit
- *Test Crafter* CD-ROM with Audio CD for listening sections of tests

Reading Class Materials

Intensive Reading:

- *Very Easy True Stories, A Picture-Based First Reader*
- *All New Very Easy True Stories, A Picture-Based First Reader*
- *Easy True Stories, A Picture-Based Beginning Reader*
- *True Stories in the News, A Beginning Reader*
- *More True Stories, A High Beginning Reader*

Extensive Reading:

The *Thomson Foundation Reading Library* consists of readers graded at seven levels with six readers per level, ranging from 75 to 350 headwords and 500 to 2,500 total words and includes adventure, drama, detective, and romance stories.

- 6 level 1 books – 75 headwords; 500 to 620 total words
- 6 level 2 books – 100 headwords; 600 to 740 total words
- 6 level 3 books – 150 headwords; 680 to 920 total words
- 6 level 4 books – 200 headwords; 980 to 1,300 total words
- 6 level 5 books – 250 headwords; 1,150 to 1,700 total words
- 6 level 6 books – 300 headwords; 1,900 to 2,200 total words
- 6 level 7 books – 350 headwords; 2,100 to 2,500 total words

They are illustrated in full color and have carefully controlled language. They practice, extend, and recycle the most useful and frequent vocabulary, phrases and expressions that beginning learners need. They also have a carefully-controlled grammar syllabus that covers the grammar most typically taught in the early years of learning English.

See Appendix E for information about the recycling of vocabulary in these readers.

Vocabulary Class Materials

- *The Heinle Picture Dictionary* (with a monolingual English version and bilingual versions printed in 6 languages – Chinese, Haitian Creole, Japanese, Korean, Portuguese, and Spanish)
- *The Heinle Picture Dictionary* Beginning Workbook with audio CDs
- *The Heinle Picture Dictionary* Lesson Planner with Activity Bank and Classroom Presentation Tool CD-ROM

Lab class materials

- *All the Right Type*
- *Rosetta Stone* Level 1, Version 3 (We purchased 10 licenses for \$2,570.)

Appendix D: Vocabulary Topic Comparison – *Touchstone* and *Picture Dictionary*

Touchstone

1. All About You
2. In Class
3. Favorite People
4. Everyday Life
5. Free Time
6. Neighborhoods
7. Out and About
8. Shopping
9. A Wide World
10. Busy Lives
11. Looking Back
12. Fabulous Food

Heinle Picture Dictionary

1. Basic Words
2. School
3. Family
4. People
5. Community
6. Housing
7. Food
8. Clothing
9. Transportation
10. Health
11. Work
12. Earth and Space
13. Animals, Plants, and Habitats
14. School Subjects
15. The Arts
16. Recreation

Teach Heinle Picture Dictionary in this order:

- 1, 2, 3, 4 (1st 3 topics), 5, 6, 16, 8, 4 (last 4 topics), 9, 10, 7

Appendix E: Recycling of Vocabulary in Graded Readers

In response to my email, Joel Deutser of Cengage Learning sent me the following information about the recycling of vocabulary in the *Thomson Foundation Reading Library*. He mentioned that this information came directly from one of the authors of the series. He said that the key vocabulary “is in fact recycled a lot.”

The following table shows how many times each word at that level is recycled in the series on average.

Level One	75 headwords	534.6
Level Two	100 headwords	108.9
Level Three	150 headwords	60.1
Level Four	200 headwords	45.9
Level Five	250 headwords	25.5
Level Six	300 headwords	22.4
Level Seven	350 headwords	6.6

He also attached a detailed spreadsheet (see Table E1 below) showing how each word is recycled. He said that we can expect lower numbers at higher levels as there are fewer stories to use them in as new words come online. He added, “You can imagine how long it took to get the figures this high.”

Table E1

Recycling of words in the Thomson Foundation Reading Library

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7	Total*
75	2475	2947	3114	5334	6170	9624	10428	40092.0
100	34	275	222	377	423	693	698	2722.0
150	88	49	356	497	491	773	752	3006.0
200	53	57	68	496	360	669	590	2293.0
250	41	36	55	30	296	365	454	1277.0
300	26	35	57	56	41	548	355	1118.0
350	17	23	15	35	18	19	205	332.0
PT	179	401	267	551	597	788	917	3700.0
not in	32	30	98	107	98	210	262	837.0
Total	2945	3853	4252	7483	8494	13689	14661	55377.0
75	84.0%	76.5%	73.2%	71.3%	72.6%	70.3%	71.1%	
100	1.2%	7.1%	5.2%	5.0%	5.0%	5.1%	4.8%	
150	3.0%	1.3%	8.4%	6.6%	5.8%	5.6%	5.1%	
200	1.8%	1.5%	1.6%	6.6%	4.2%	4.9%	4.0%	

250	1.4%	0.9%	1.3%	0.4%	3.5%	2.7%	3.1%	
300	0.9%	0.9%	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	4.0%	2.4%	
350	0.6%	0.6%	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%	0.1%	1.4%	
PT	6.1%	10.4%	6.3%	7.4%	7.0%	5.8%	6.3%	
not in	1.1%	0.8%	2.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.5%	1.8%	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	
75	414	403	422	481	501	531	518	
100	19	103	82	120	111	140	135	
150	36	28	124	175	176	203	191	
200	16	24	30	185	176	204	193	
250	13	15	22	12	160	162	176	
300	11	17	24	21	19	170	146	
350	7	8	8	9	8	10	89	
PT	40	70	80	110	93	118	134	
not in	20	24	39	41	51	68	103	
								Total
75	33.0	39.3	41.5	71.1	82.3	128.3	139.0	534.6**
100	1.4	11.0	8.9	15.1	16.9	27.7	27.9	108.9
150	1.8	1.0	7.1	9.9	9.8	15.5	15.0	60.1
200	1.1	1.1	1.4	9.9	7.2	13.4	11.8	45.9
250	0.8	0.7	1.1	0.6	5.9	7.3	9.1	25.5
300	0.5	0.7	1.1	1.1	0.8	11.0	7.1	22.4
350	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.4	4.1	6.6
PT	4.5	5.7	3.3	5.0	6.4	6.7	6.8	38.5
not in	1.6	1.3	2.5	2.6	1.9	3.1	2.5	15.5

*total number of words of a given level used at that and later levels

**mean number of times each word was used

Appendix F: Development – Hours

Date	Time	Type of Activity	Total Hours Spent
Fri, April 3, 2009	10 a.m. to 12 noon 12 noon to 1 p.m. Afternoon	Meeting with Jenya Meeting with Rossana Individual work (bath notes, phone calls, organizing, checking out materials)	2 = 2 +1 = 3 +2 = 5
Sat, April 4, 2009	12:30 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.	Typing up notes from yesterday, organizing computer files for ideas Typing up ideas, organizing records, sending emails	+1 = 6 +1 = 7
Mon, April 6, 2009	4 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Organize binder	+1 = 8
Tue, May 5, 2009	12:15 p.m. to 2:15 p.m.	Typing up ideas, brainstorming, checking on USCIS requirements	+2 = 10
Fri, May 8, 2009	9:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.	Meeting with Dr. Evans, emails	+1 = 11
Mon, May 11, 2009	3 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Study <i>Touchstone</i> and <i>Side by Side</i>	+2 = 13
Tue, May 12, 2009	2 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.	Curriculum Comm. Mtg. and Meeting with NE	+1 ½ = 14 ½
Thu, May 14, 2009	12 noon to 4 p.m.	Interview Joyce, Ben, Marisa	+ 4 = 17 ½
Thu, May 14, 2009	4:15 p.m. to 6:15 p.m.	Review materials (readers) and type interview reports	+2 = 19 ½
Tue, May 19, 2009	12 noon to 2:30 p.m.	Type interview reports, add homework, intern ideas,	+2 ½ = 22
Tue, May 19, 2009	3 p.m. to 4 p.m.	Meeting with NE	+1 = 23
Thu, May 21, 2009	4 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Meeting with Kristi Lundstrom	+1 = 24
Mon, May 25, 2009	12 noon to 6 p.m.	Organizing Class Schedule, reviewing <i>Touchstone</i> materials	+6 = 30
Tues, May 26, 2009	11 a.m. to 7 p.m.	Mtg with Inna, organizing and typing interviews, classrooms, class schedule, Curr. Comm. Mtg. (2 p.m.) Mtg with NE (3:30 p.m.) Mtg. with NE, James &	+8 = 38

		Kristi, Examining materials, Pronunciation videotapes	
Thu, May 28, 2009	12 noon to 2 p.m.	Interview Judson Hart, Examine All the Right Type, Softread, Check on True Story series in Joyce's office	+2 = 40
Tues, June 2, 2009	11 a.m. to 4 p.m.	Touchstone website, examining costs, resources, typing up interview reports, typing up results of last week's meetings, Mtg. with NE (3 p.m.)	+5 = 45
Thu, June 4, 2009	8:15 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.	Touchstone	+1 = 46
Sat, June 20, 2009		Livemocha.com, Imagine Learning	+1 = 47
Mon, June 22, 2009	1 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Emails, phone calls, type Troy interview, Touchstone, Imagine Learning	+4 = 51
Tue, June 23, 2009	11 a.m. to 6 p.m.	Active Intro, catalogs, Pronunciation videotapes, livemocha.com, lexialearning.com, vocabulary books, picture dictionaries, class schedule, 3:30 p.m. meeting with NE, Rosetta Stone at ELC	+7 = 58
Thu, June 25, 2009	Throughout the day	Emails to NE, Rosetta Stone, check out more of Rosetta Stone	+1 = 59
Tue, June 30, 2009	1 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Emails, examine flashmybrain.com, type report, study Touchstone, meeting with NE	+4 = 63
Tue, July 7, 2009	2:45 to 3:45 p.m.	Curriculum Committee meeting	+1 = 64
Wed, July 8, 2009	12 noon to 3 p.m.	Emails, goals and objectives, getting acquainted with Touchstone	+3 = 67
Thu, July 9, 2009	11 a.m. to 12 noon	Goals and objectives	+1 = 68
Mon, July 13, 2009		Questions for Helen Sandiford, organizing, emails	+1 = 69
Tue, July 14, 2009	1 p.m. to 5 p.m.	Mtg with Rossana, Mtg with Heidi HYTE	+4 = 73
Wed, July 15, 2009	11 a.m. to 3 p.m.	Review True Stories series, emails, Update, Mtg with	+4 = 77

		NE, Rossana	
Thu, July 16, 2009	2 to 4 p.m.	Meetings – NE, Curriculum Committee	+2 = 79
Fri, July 17, 2009	1 to 3 p.m.	Work in lab at ELC, organize class schedule	+2 = 81
Sat, July 18, 2009	5 to 7:30 a.m.	Explore Oxford Picture Dictionary online, develop class schedule	+2 ½ = 83 1/2
Sat, July 18, 2009	Afternoon and evening	Explore graded readers – Heinle, Cambridge, Oxford, Pearson-Longman	+2 ½ = 86
Mon, July 20, 2009	10 to 11 a.m.	Research graded readers – catalogs and online; type up report	+1 = 87
Tue, July 21, 2009	9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	Research graded readers online; call reps; email EC; meeting with Helen Sandiford; meeting with NE; Joyce – <i>Very Easy True Stories</i>	+7 = 94
Wed, July 22, 2009	10:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.	TREC mtg; mtg with Marisa to plan Touchstone pilot; explore readers in SASC	+3 = 97
Thu, July 23, 2009	5 to 7 a.m. 1:30 to 2:30 p.m. 2:30 to 3 p.m. 11 p.m. to 12:30 a.m.	Prepare for mtg with NE: Graded Readers Mtg w/ Heidi HYTE, Rossana Mtg with NE Correlate Touchstone units with Heinle units	+2 = 99 +1=100 +2=102
Fri, July 24, 2009	10 to 11 a.m. 1 to 3:30 p.m.	Type up reading report Prepare to pilot teach Touchstone Unit 10	+1=103 +2 ½ =105 ½
Mon, July 27, 2009	1:30 to 2:30 p.m. 6:30 – 8 p.m.	Observe Marisa teach pilot Lesson 10A, prepare to teach Pilot Lesson 10B	+2 ½ =108
Tue, July 28, 2009	1:30 to 2:30 p.m. 4 to 6 p.m.	Teach Lesson 10B Prepare Lesson 10C, emails	+3=111
Wed, July 29, 2009	12 noon to 3 p.m.	Prepare for and teach Touchstone Lesson 10C & D	+3=114
Thu, July 30, 2009	12 noon to 4 p.m.	Prepare for and teach Touchstone DVD and quizzes, meet with NE (in hall), meet with Rossana – report on Helen Sandiford	+4=118
Fri, July 31, 2009	9:00 a.m. to 2 p.m.	Prepare for mtgs and meet	+5=123

		with Teresa Martin (10:30 to 11:30) and Julina Magnusson (11:30 to 1:30), correct quizzes for Touchstone pilot unit	
Mon, Aug 3, 2009	11 a.m. to 2 p.m.	ELC meeting for students and teachers; emails to Julina about graded readers, email to NE, letter to interns, email to Marisa	+3=126
Tue, Aug 4, 2009	1:30 to 4:30 p.m.	Type up interview reports, type up report for NE for Thursday, examine <i>Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> materials	+3=129
Thu, Aug 6, 2009	1:30 to 3:30 p.m.	Interview Grant, meeting NE, organize	+2=131
Fri, Aug 7, 2009	12 noon to 3 p.m.	Emails – NE about intern letter, NE about ordering Heinle PDs, Troy about research, update class schedule, rewrite intern letter, type Grant interview	+3=134
Sat, Aug 8, 2009	8:30 to 10:30 a.m.	Cost analysis	+2=136
Tue, Aug 11, 2009		Prepare for mtg with NE	+2=138
Thu, Aug 13, 2009	1 to 3 p.m.	Prepare for & meet with NE	+2=140
Fri, Aug 14, 2009	3:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.	Prepare for & meet with Lauren, meet with Troy	+2=142
Tue, Aug 18, 2009	12 noon to 3 p.m.	Meet with Sarah Lutz, Troy Cox, NE, Curriculum Committee	+3=145
Wed, Aug 19, 2009	2 to 3 p.m.	Meet with Sharon Tavares	+1=146
Thu, Aug 20, 2009	7 to 8 a.m., 12 to 1 p.m., 3 to 5 p.m.	Organize, emails, prepare for 8/25 mtg with NE, revise class schedule	+4=150
Tue, Aug 25, 2009	10 a.m. to 12 noon	Meet with interns	+2=152
Wed, Aug 26, 2009	1 to 3 p.m.	Meet with NE and organize	+2=154
Thu, Aug 27, 2009	1 to 3 p.m.	Work on objectives	+2=156
Fri, Aug 28, 2009	10 a.m. to 3 p.m.	Prepare for intern training meeting, meet with interns	+5=161
Wed, Sep 2, 2009	1 to 4 p.m.	Meet with Lauren, Opening Assembly – met 3 students, Meet with Sharon	+3=164
Thu, Sep 3, 2009	7 to 8 a.m. 11 a.m. to 1 p.m.	Emails, mtg prep New teacher orientation mtg, mtg with NE, meet with Lisa	+1=165 +2=167

Fri, Sep 4, 2009	12 to 1 p.m.	Talk with Troy about setting up lab times, etc.	+1=168
Sat, Sep 5, 2009	12 to 2 p.m.	Emails to new students, get translations, cut and paste	+2=170
Mon, Sep 7, 2009	7 to 10 p.m.	Sort materials for interns, long emails to interns with instructions for first day, set up intern Friday meeting schedule	+3=170
Tue, Sep 8, 2009	4:30 to 6:30 p.m.	Reserve lab and TVs on ELC scheduler for semester, plan training sessions for interns, emails to interns	+2=170

Appendix G: Development – Notes from Interviews

Administrative Executive Secretary

May 14, 2009

- Calendar structure
 - 52 class periods
 - 14 weeks
 - 4 classes per day
 - 65 minutes per class
 - Joyce will send me Fall 2009 calendar in its current state
 - 180 total students is the goal

- Classrooms – always plenty available
 - Use room 362?

- Lab scheduling
 - Lab is always very busy during class time
 - Use labs from 3 to 4 p.m.?
 - Assign lab work as homework only?

- Tutors
 - L/S tasks – practice 5 times with one tutor, then 5 times with another tutor
 - Shadow Reading – read along silently while tutor reads aloud, then read same passage back to the tutor

- Suggestions for materials
 - Grammar
 - *Basic English Grammar* – Betty Azar with teacher’s guide
 - Vocabulary
 - *Word by Word* Picture dictionaries with teacher’s manual
 - Oxford picture dictionary with workbook
 - LAT practice
 - Reading Comprehension Practice Cards: Reading for Detail
 - Misc.
 - Jazz Chants
 - Reading Rainbow DVD
 - Flash cards in office
 - Irregular past tenses
 - Phrasal verbs
 - Other flash cards – BYU bookstore can order languages need in bilingual flash cards
 - Games in office
 - Sight Word Bingo (picture words)
 - Reader – *Flying Home*

**Skill Area Coordinator #1
May 14, 2009**

- Overall Concept
 - Class/workshop type Course
 - Divide class periods up differently
 - Blended learning
- Interns
 - Be in charge of 30-minute blocks
- Lab time
 - Use break between 10:35 a.m. and 12:15 p.m.
- Ideas for class projects (or Language Learning Fairs)
 - Create a video
 - Write a book project
 - Be in charge of a bulletin board
 - Be in charge of an activity
- Computer programs
 - Look up online programs
 - Softread
 - Reading rate can be self-regulated
 - All SASC readers are entered
 - Reading Horizons
 - Probably too advanced for Level 0s
 - Contact Heidi HYTE

**Fellow MA Student Familiar with the Intern Program and Touchstone Materials
May 14, 2009**

- Interns – Ling 496R
 - 5 – 8 available per semester
 - Some are attending the class, more are enrolled who are available for hours of internship
 - 150 total hours required
- Web sites
 - RenaissanceLeraning.com
 - English in a Flash – flashmybrain.com –
 - Creates flashcards for a small membership fee
 - Can be shared with students
- Touchstone
 - Web sites

- www.cambridge.org/US/ESL/touchstone
 - For further information about the Touchstone series
- www.cambridge.org/touchstonearcade
 - Teaches how to use Touchstone materials
 - Provides additional materials free of charge for students and teachers
- Additional materials to obtain
 - Classroom CDs for L/S tests
 - Test Crafter for adjusting tests to class needs
- Possibility of using *Touchstone* materials for Foundations Levels A and B
- Presentation to NE and/or curriculum committee by fellow MA student?
- Possibility of fellow MA student teaching Foundations Prep for Fall 2009?
- *Interactions Access*
 - For Foundations Level C Reading and Listening/Speaking

Skill Area Coordinator #2
May 21, 2009

- Text book order cutoff is June 15th
- Rotate content topics for Academic Level C (Athelia)
- L/S packets – Introductory level
- Talk to Judson about lab times
- Should definitely have some extensive reading for 0s
- Should try to stick to normal class times as much as possible to increase chances of interactions with other ELC students

Skill Area Coordinator #3
May 26, 2009

- Level 0 L/S packet
 - No tests to go with it
 - Never been used
 - Teachers invent their own activities to go with packets
 - Introduce vocabulary lists of words and phrases for them to memorize
 - Introduce task, preview material like for reading

- Listen in class
 - Cloze activities
 - Answer questions
 - Listen for vocabulary
 - Speaking activities
 - “Grammatically Correct”
 - Computer program produced by Heather Torey
 - Speaking activities based on “Focus on Grammar”
 - Inna doesn’t know if they have been developed for basic level
 - Reading Horizons
 - Phonics
 - Reading Horizons
 - Inna used this in Reading Level 2
- Students felt overwhelmed, enough material for much more than one semester

Lab Technician

May 28, 2009

- Heather Torey’s “Grammatically Correct” – no longer on computers, no one was using it, he doesn’t think she developed anything for the lower levels. He only knew about level 3 stuff.
- Could use Photo Booth to record themselves speaking
- All the Right Type
 - Default setting is to go through from beginning to end without being able to skip ahead
 - Teachers can check progress
- Rosetta Stone
 - Discount for educational institution sight license
 - Ask Troy if BYU already has a license for Rosetta Stone (email in to Troy)
- Lab times
 - First 2 days of semester are not busy
 - Class time is busy
 - 3 to 4 p.m. would be ideal, no problem
- Training Level 0s to use computer programs
 - START WITH BASICS
 - In general, the less English people know, the less computer experience they have.
 - Remember that they are probably unfamiliar with computers in general
 - Don’t assume any prior knowledge
 - Begin with “This is a mouse.”

Technology and Assessment Coordinator

June 2, 2009

- ESL house, like Chinese house, etc. at BYU. Have Foundations Prep students in special housing
- Former director used to take the students camping
- Used to have classes at 7 a.m.
- Field trips in morning, instruction from 1 to 5 p.m.
- L/S class – cultural assignments every weekend – restaurant, bank, grocery store, pioneering
- Ethnographer – ask native speaker assigned question and record answer; analyze answers for English structures
- Placement test
 - Grammar – adaptive
 - Reading – adaptive
 - Listening – adaptive
 - Written essay
 - Spoken interview the next day (grades from previous day’s tests are available to interviewer)
- Computer programs for beginners
 - TALL (Technology-assisted Language Learning) – Troy doesn’t like it (neither does Dr. Evans – nothing further being developed for it)
 - ELLIS – software like TALL – TPR type, not very expensive

**Skill Area Coordinator #4
July 31, 2009**

1. Have you taught Level 0 students?
2. What is most essential for Level 0 students to learn?

VOCABULARY!!!

3. What materials might be the most effective for Level 0 students?
4. What are some ELC facilities and times that may be underused?
5. Organization of Reading class as it stands so far
 - True Stories series

- Suggests that we have them buy their own copies of the *Very Easy True Stories*
- Graded Readers – many new ones for early beginners aimed at adult learners – see catalogs
 - She will forward my emails to publishers’ reps requesting sample copies of graded readers and supplemental material
 - Suggests having class sets of the readers for the Foundations Prep students.
 - She wondered who had complained that some of the material was too childish; she disagrees. She thinks it is fine to have the children’s books in the SASC and for reading together as a class. She likes the Frog and Toad series for them.

6. SASC readers for students to check out, Dr. Evans’ idea to have a volunteer organize the books for all levels (leave them in levels 1 to 5? Reorganize them into 3 Foundations levels and 3 Academic levels? Get rid of Dr. Seuss, etc.?)

**Skill Area Coordinator #5 (with Skill Area Coordinator #6)
August 6, 2009**

- In place of, or in addition to, *All the Right Type*, use *SenseLang.org*, which is free on the internet
 - Dr. Evans says it is not wise to use something that is free on the internet because it could disappear at any time
 - I could tell students about it and they could use it at home for additional practice
 - SAC #6 (who was present for our entire interview) says there are sometimes problems with looking at a student’s history on *All the Right Type*. Lab Technician says that he can work it out for us. He also says there is no update for *All the Right Type* that they could locate; they have already tried.
- SAC #5 suggested I use the *Heinle Picture Dictionary* materials 4 days a week instead of 2 or 3 days a week. That is what I am going to do. This will put all of the Touchstone materials at the disposal of the Lead Teacher instead of using some of them during the Vocabulary time slot as I had intended to do. It also keeps the entire plan more simple and clear, as Dr. Evans has been suggesting.

Appendix H: Development – Class Schedule – Fall 2009

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
Week 1 (3 days)	Xxxx Prior week – training of interns	9:30 to 11 a.m. Overview, get books 12:15 Grammar Diagnostic test 1:30 Intro – <i>Heinle PictDict</i> 3 to 4 p.m. Lab Intro <i>Rosetta Stone</i>	9:30 a.m. Introduction to <i>Touchstone</i> 12:15 1:30 <i>Heinle</i> 3 p.m. Lab – Intro – Typing	9:30 a.m. 12:15 1:30 <i>Heinle</i> 3 p.m. Lab – Type and Rosetta Stone	
Week 2 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 1	9:30 Lesson 1A 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 1B 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 1C 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 1D 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 1
Week 3 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 2	9:30 Lesson 2A 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 2B 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 2C 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 2D 12:15 <i>Very Easy</i> <i>True Stories</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 2 Reading TEST 1
Week 4 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 3	9:30 Lesson 3A 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 3B 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 3C 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 3D 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 3
Week 5 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 4	9:30 Lesson 4A 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 4B 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 4C 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 4D 12:15 <i>All New</i> <i>Very Easy True</i> 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 4 Reading TEST 2
Week 6 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 5	9:30 Lesson 5A 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 5B 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 5C 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 5D 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 5
Week 7 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 6	9:30 Lesson 6A 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> <i>Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i>	9:30 Lesson 6B 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> <i>Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i>	9:30 Lesson 6C 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> <i>Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle</i> <i>Picture Dictionary</i>	9:30 Lesson 6D 12:15 <i>Easy True</i> <i>Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 TS QUIZ 6	TS TEST 1 Reading TEST 3

	3 p.m. Lab	3 p.m. Lab	3 p.m. Lab	3 p.m. Lab	
Week 8 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 7	9:30 Lesson 7A 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 7B 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 7C 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 7D 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 7
Week 9 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 8	9:30 Lesson 8A 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 8B 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 8C 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 8D 12:15 <i>True Stories in the News</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 8 Reading TEST 4
Week 10 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 9	9:30 Lesson 9A 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 9B 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 9C 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 9D 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 9
Week 11 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 10	9:30 Lesson 10A 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 10B 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 10C 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 10D 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	TS QUIZ 10 Reading TEST 5
Week 12 (2 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 11	9:30 Lesson 11A 12:15 Lesson 11B 1:30 TS DVD 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 11C 12:15 Lesson 11D 1:30 TS QZ 11 3 p.m. Lab	Xxxx	Xxxx	xxxx
Week 13 (4 days) <i>Touchstone</i> UNIT 12	9:30 Lesson 12A 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 12B 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 12C 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 <i>The Heinle Picture Dictionary</i> 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 Lesson 12D 12:15 <i>More True Stories</i> , Extensive Reading 1:30 TS QUIZ 12 3 pm Lab	TS TEST 2 Reading TEST 6
Week 14 (2 days) (Total: 51 days)	9:30 LAT prep 12:15 Tour bookstore 1:30 3 p.m. Lab	9:30 LAT prep 12:15 1:30 3 p.m. Lab	Xxxx	Xxxx	

Appendix I: Student Questionnaire – End of Fall Semester 2009

1. What did you like best about the whole Foundations Prep program?

The best I liked about the whole Foundations Prep program was the vocabulary.

All

It was a program where the students learned a lot of vocabulary. The teachers had patient whit the students. We learned grammar basic. The more help for my, was listening because when I began the semester I couldn't listened a conversation or see a movie with subtitle off.

2. What would you change about the whole Foundations Prep Program?

Nothing I like it, like that

nothing

I would change the classes of reading on Thursdays for a class writing.

3. What did you like about all the Foundations Prep materials (books, workbooks, computer programs, etc.)?

I like all them

all

It were materials super good, because everything were a big help for learn English for my. I liked everything.

4. What would you change about all the Foundations Prep materials?

Nothing

I have no idea.

Maybe I would put a program for writing basic because I think that it was the thing that I wanted learn too.

5. What activities or classes helped you learn the most?

Vocabulary and computer programs.

Actually, most help for me tutoring. If no tutor, maybe I couldn't follow the class.

Rosetta Stone was a big program that helped me for practice a lot of topics that I learned in my classes. Other was in class of reading when we played flyswatter that was fun. In vocabulary was the activity where the teacher said a word and after we spell in the black board.

6. What activities or classes were not as helpful?

All them were helpful for me.

I think that everything was helpful.

7. Do you have any other comments?

I think it well be much better if you can add some writing classes.

My tutor helped and encouraged me. If I didn't have tutor, I may couldn't follow in class.

Thank you teacher Mrs. MaGovern, and the others teachers for your help. You are wonderful teachers, thank you so much.

Appendix J: Intern Questionnaire – End of Fall Semester 2009

1. What did you like best about the Foundations Prep program?

I liked the opportunity to become familiar with the ELC and its resources as an undergraduate. It's great to have a better idea of how it's organized and be able to teach without yet being a graduate student.

I loved the students we worked with. They were all very fun and eager to participate.

I loved the students and the helpful, relaxed atmosphere. I liked the idea of giving them more time and instruction before throwing them into the English language.

I liked how I was given an opportunity to teach in a real classroom where the students got grades that really counted towards their report cards.

2. What did you learn from your participation in the program?

I learned a lot about working with beginning learners, especially about how to focus my directions and explanations to meet their needs.

I learned that it is so important to talk slow and repeat yourself a lot. Even when you think students understand, if you ask them questions you often find that isn't the case.

It was helpful to see some of how the program is run and set up. It also helped me to understand the preparation that goes into a class and lesson plans. I gained practical experience teaching and preparing.

I got a lot of first-hand teaching experience and got a feel for what it would be like to teach in the real world.

3. What changes would you make in the program for future semesters?

I think it would be beneficial to try out some more of the ideas in Touchstone. Sometimes I felt like I was getting monotonous, but I think Touchstone has a lot of resources that I could have tapped into more.

Incorporate some assignments from other classes into lab time so that students can see the benefit of typing and knowing how to navigate a computer in general.

I think the tutoring helped a lot. I also think it would benefit the students to be provided with and made aware of other aids and resources for learning.

Maybe pick (vocabulary) topics that are more engaging to students. They didn't seem to like learning about "City Park."

4. What did you like about the teaching materials?

I liked the organization of the text around a corpus – I felt like what we were teaching was applicable and helpful for daily life.

I loved Rosetta Stone once it was up and running. I thought the pronunciation and listening sections were very helpful. I also liked the typing program; it was easy to navigate.

I thought they were fairly simple and easy to use. They seemed to be at an appropriate level for the students.

They were very clear and very helpful and I thought they were effective. I liked how you could change the (vocabulary) lesson plan depending on level.

5. What changes would you make in the teaching materials?

Just as I said before – I don't think I would change them, but as a teacher I would try to make better use of all the ideas.

I might make some of the areas in Rosetta Stone more difficult. All students had very high scores and we could have challenged them more.

The materials I worked with were great.

None.

6. What advice would you give to future interns in the program?

Be creative – use all the resources you have and try to bring in new ideas to make class interesting and new for them and for you.

Come prepared with a back-up plan in case of tech problems. Come up with half time activities and chat with students before class to get to know them.

Be flexible and prepared for changes and interruptions. Get to know the students, their strengths, weaknesses, motivations and goals. It will help in your teaching.

Always come with more material prepared than needed. You'll never know what will happen.

7. Do you have any further comments?

This internship was great! I learned a lot about Rosetta Stone and just teaching in general. I learned about class management and really enjoyed the experience.

You are an amazing and inspiring person, Jessica! Thank you so much for the opportunity!

Thanks, Jessica, for a wonderful semester. You were always great at keeping us informed and you were so helpful and understanding.

Appendix K: Fall Semester 2009 Interns

All Skills Class 9:30 – 11:00 a.m. M-Th
 Lead Teacher: Jessica McGovern (Foundations Prep Teacher/Supervisor) M-Th
 Asst. Teacher: Intern #1 (M-Th)
 DVD Teacher: Intern #1 (M-Th)

Reading Class 12:15 – 1:20 p.m. M-Th
 Lead Teacher: Intern #3 (M-W)
 Asst. Teacher: Intern #6 (Th)

Vocabulary Class 1:30 – 2:35 p.m. M-Th
 Lead Teacher: Intern #2 (M-Th)

Lab Class 3:00 – 4:00 p.m. M-Th
 Lead Teacher: Intern #5 (M,W)
 Asst. Teacher: Intern #1 (T)
 Asst. Teacher: Inter #6 (Th)

Test Proctor/Lab Class 10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. Friday
 Intern #3

Tutors
 Intern #s 1, 3

Intern Assignments (by Intern) Fall 2009

Intern #1

All Skills Asst. Teacher	9:30 – 11:00 a.m.	M/ W
	9:30 – 9:45 a.m.	T/Th
Lab Asst Teacher	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	T
In-service meeting	1:30 p.m.	F

Intern #2

Vocabulary Lead Teacher	1:30 – 2:35 p.m.	M-Th
In-service meeting	2:00 p.m.	F

Intern #3

Reading Lead Teacher	12:15 – 1:20 p.m.	M-W
Test Proctor	10:00 – 12:00 noon	F
Lab Asst. Teacher	12:00 – 1:00 p.m.	F
In-service meeting	1:00 p.m.	F

Intern #4

Lab Asst. Teacher	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	Th
In-service meeting	2:30 p.m.	F

Intern #5

Lab Lead Teacher	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	M, W
In-service meeting	2:30 p.m.	F

Intern #6

Reading Asst. Teacher	12:15 – 1:20 p.m.	Th
In-service meeting	1:00 p.m.	F

Appendix L: Schedules for Winter Semester 2010 Interns

<u>All Skills Class</u>	9:15 – 10:45 a.m.	M-Th
	Lead Teacher: Intern #9 (M-Th)	
	Asst. Teacher: Intern #6 (M-Th)	
	DVD Teacher: Intern # 4 (M-Th)	
<u>Vocabulary Class</u>	12:15 – 1:20 p.m.	M-Th
	Lead Teacher: Intern #8 (M-Th)	
	Asst. Teacher: Intern #7 (M-Th)	
<u>Reading Class</u>	1:30 – 2:35 p.m.	M-Th
	Teacher: Intern #5 (M/W)	
	Teacher: Intern #3 (T/Th)	
	Asst. Teacher: Intern # 1 (M/W)	
<u>Lab Class</u>	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	M-Th
	Intern #5 (M/W) W – Intern #5 leaves at 3:45 (Jessica comes)	
	Intern #3 (T/Th)	
<u>Writing Class</u>	4:00 p.m.	M-Th
	Lead Teacher: Intern #10 (M/W)	
	Asst. Teacher: Intern #1 (M-Th)	
	Asst. Teacher: Intern #7 (M-Th)	
<u>Test Proctor/Lab Class</u>	10:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.	Friday
	Intern #11	
	Sub: Intern #1	
<u>Quiz and Test Developer, Micrograde Specialist</u>		
	Intern #2	
<u>Tutors – Foundations Prep</u>		
	Intern #s 1, 3, 4 (L1-Japanese), 5, 6, 7, 9, 10 (L1-Ukrainian), 11 (L1-Spanish)	
<u>Tutors – Foundations A</u>		
	Intern #s 3, 4, 6, 9 and 10	
<u>Research Project Assignment for Dr. Evans</u>		
	Intern #11	

Intern Assignments (by Intern) Winter 2010

Intern #1		
Reading Asst. Teacher	1:30 – 2:35 p.m.	M/W
Writing Asst. Teacher	4:00 p.m.	M-Th
Tutor – Foundations Prep		
Intern #2		
Quiz and Test Developer		
Micrograde Specialist		
Intern #3		
Reading Teacher	1:30 – 2:35 p.m.	T/Th
Lab Class	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	T/Th
Tutor – Foundations Prep and Foundations A		
Intern #4		
All Skills DVD Teacher	9:15 – 10:45 a.m.	M-Th
Tutor (L1-Japanese) – Foundations Prep and Foundations A		
Intern #5		
Reading Teacher	1:30 – 2:35 p.m.	M/W
Lab Class	3:00 – 4:00 p.m.	M/W (leave 3:45)
Tutor – Foundations Prep and Foundations A		
Intern #6		
All Skills Asst. Teacher	9:15 – 10:45 a.m.	M-Th
Tutor – Foundations Prep and Foundations A		
Intern #7		
Vocabulary Asst. Teacher	12:15 – 1:20 p.m.	M-Th
Writing Asst. Teacher	4:00 p.m.	M-Th
Tutor – Foundations Prep		
Intern #8		
Vocabulary Lead Teacher	12:15 – 1:20 p.m.	M-Th
Intern #9		
All Skills Lead Teacher	9:15 – 10:45 a.m.	M-Th
Tutor – Foundations Prep and Foundations A		
Intern #10		
Writing Lead Teacher	4:00 p.m.	M/W
Tutor – Foundations A		
Intern #11		
Test Proctor	10:00 a.m. – 12:00	Friday
Lab Class	12:00 – 1:00 p.m.	Friday
Tutor – (L1 – Spanish) Foundations Prep		
In-service Meetings		
Intern #s 1, 2, 4, 9, 11	11:00 a.m. – 12	Friday
Intern #s 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10	4:15 – 5:15 p.m.	Friday

Foundations Prep Sample Hours Calculation – Winter Semester 2010

This is an excerpt from an email sent to an intern in response to her question about hours. It is offered as just one example of how intern hours are spent.

“For Winter Semester 2010 there are exactly 26 Tuesday/Thursday class days. You will be teaching one 65-minute class on those days. 26 times 65 equals 1,690 minutes divided by 60 minutes per hour equals about 28 hours you will actually spend in that class. Since you are the only T/Th teacher, you will teach all of those days and will spend about the same amount of time in preparation, so that gives us 56 hours for the reading class.

“Then you have a 1-hour lab class on each of those 26 Tuesdays and Thursdays, so that adds 26 hours to 56, and we are at 82 hours. There shouldn't be much prep for the lab once we are into the semester, so we won't add too much for that, let's say maybe about 8 hours, bringing us to 90 hours.

“Now, we need to figure in all of the interviews, training and in-service meetings, and meetings with your co-teachers. I'm going to guess that at around 20 hours, with another 10 or so to study reading ahead of time and get familiar with the lab programs, so we're up to 120 hours.

“That leaves us with about 30 hours of tutoring and we're there! To get that much tutoring, you would have to do a little more than an hour each Tuesday and Thursday, which I think fits in well, depending on your availability.

“As you can see, we never know for sure exactly how it will work out, but we can make a pretty good guess and do some adjusting as we go. If you don't think you can fit the tutoring in, adjust it as necessary.”