Impact study online audience 19 February 2019

- What objective and subjective factors hinder the implementation of ESP in Europe and in Ukraine in particular?

  One key factor that I highlighted in the evaluation results was institutional support, particularly the amount of time that academic departments are willing to allocate to English classes. In Ukraine, foreign language departments depend on the allocation they receive from academic departments and in some cases this is very limited. In Ukraine this seems to be a major obstacle. I don't know if this applies to other contexts in Europe too. Prior to the project, another factor that hindered ESP was limited pedagogical knowledge in teachers. This is an issue that EfU addressed and the participating teachers now know how to approach ESP in a more contemporary manner.

- As the Observer did you notice that some Universities prefer consuming the "shared ESP product" instead of developing their own one (Programmes, plans, etc)?

  When teachers are involved in educational reform it is normal that initially they will tend to keep close to the new models or products they are introduced to. These provide the support and reassurance that teachers need in initial stages of reform. As teachers become more confident and develop a greater mastery of the new ideas the reform is promoting (in this case, new approaches to ESP) they will be more willing to experiment in more independent ways and to develop their own materials and techniques. The shared ESP product in EfU was a syllabus template that has been valuable in providing a broad level of consistency across institutions, but in terms of individual ESP courses for specific disciplines I did sense that teachers are increasingly being given more autonomy in what they do.

- While observing changes in Ukrainian universities, have you noticed a great desire of ESP teachers to implement innovations provided within the project? Or it was simply a craft modeling?

  As I noted above, it is normal when teachers are engaged in educational reform to initially rely on the methods they saw their trainers use. They take these back to their classrooms, try them out and see how things go. At this stage of the change process, there is therefore a fair amount of 'craft modelling'. But this is normal and even necessary so that teachers develop their skills and see first-hand how new ideas work in their classrooms. Once teachers become more confident and see that students are responding well they will start to rely less on reproducing what they saw their trainers do. In my observations, I did see similar activities from the training being used in different classrooms; in some cases teachers were using them in their own individual ways while in others they were still in 'craft' mode and needed

further time and support to use these activities in a more optimal manner.

- What's your attitude to team teaching, co-teaching in disciplinary teaching? When the conditions are right it can be an effective approach to teaching but very often institutions do not have the systems in place to facilitate it. For example, if colleagues want to co-plan, they need a common time when they are not teaching and timetabling needs to facilitate this. Workload models also need to be flexible enough to acknowledge both teachers' contributions (this is often not the case, meaning that while colleagues may co-plan, they can't both be present for classes). On a more personal level, team teaching works best with colleagues who can work well together, trust one another and are generally compatible in instructional terms.

- After the observation mission do you feel the necessity to support the budding (promising) ESP University teachers in Ukraine (by delivering special lectures, organising seminars...)

  One of my key recommendations is that universities now think seriously about the kinds of internal professional development mechanisms they can provide for ESP teachers. Teachers should have access to different opportunities, and these should be relevant to teachers' needs. If groups of younger ESP teachers exist, some analysis of their professional needs would be worthwhile so that ways of addressing these can be identified. Generally, though, one broad principle that applies to all teachers is that appropriate in-house opportunities for professional development should be provided which encourage teachers to collaborate and which focus on teaching and learning.

- How can quality assurance of teaching EMI or ESP be provided? Just some ideas for helping universities.

  A starting point is to define what 'quality' means for EMI and ESP as without criteria it is difficult to assess quality. Criteria can be developed collaboratively within institutions, with contributions by teachers and students too. For example, in EMI, quality criteria might relate to teacher competence (language and instructional skills), student engagement during EMI classes, course design and content, and assessment (formative and summative). The key question here is what factors characterize good quality EMI (or ESP)? Once criteria are defined then ways of assessing them need to be established. Quality assurance should draw on multiple sources of data, both quantitative and qualitative, and which are collected over time. So, for example, the quality of ESP classes can be assessed by external observers using a checklist or rating scale, by students who give feedback on classes, by teachers in the form of self-assessment (which can be more qualitative) and by peers (other teachers).

- We like your idea of establishing in-house CPD, some elements of which we already have. We would be grateful if you give at least some hints what to

start with? from ESP teachers.

In-house CPD should give teachers a more central role in their own learning. It should focus on real experiences of teaching and learning and engage teachers in the analysis of aspects of their work which they feel are relevant and which are important for their students. Departments can engage teachers in a consultative exercise through which a small number of priority themes for professional development are identified – formative assessment, for example, or materials design, or teaching mixed ability groups. Or else teachers can be given the freedom to form small groups with colleagues and to identify issues they want to work on. In terms of process, various models are available, such as lesson study, reflection groups, reading groups, collaborative action research and mentoring. In all of these, teachers play a central role in the process. If we want teachers to engage fully in such activities, some time for them must be made available. I also believe that some level of accountability is also necessary, so that teachers provide evidence each year of the professional development they have done – not just external activity such as attending conferences but also the kind of pedagogical CPD described here and which is closer to the classroom.

- Do you think it is a good idea to have EMI coordinator(s) at Foreign Language Departments or is it better to establish a special university subdivision? from EMI teachers

  My initial feeling would be that universities need a central point of reference for EMI and that this would not be part of FL departments. An EMI coordinator is more likely to be an academic lecturer than an FL teacher and by having a central role within the university it would perhaps give EMI a stronger institutional profile. Collaboration between FL heads and EMI coordinators would be very important though.