Abstract

The current study aims at designing a new evaluation model for evaluating PEFLTEPs in the colleges of education at Aden University in Yemen. To achieve this, a new evaluation model, EPEETSEM Model (Educational Purposes, Educational Experiences, Teaching Strategies and Evaluation Methods), is designed based on reviewing the literature on programme evaluation and procedures of the PELTEPs using the recognised methods of programme evaluation to evaluate the PELTEPs. This model focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the PEFLTEP through answering six main research questions as follows:

1. What are the standards that should be followed in evaluating the PEFLTEPs?

2. To what extent the educational purposes standards are available in the aims and objectives the PEFLTEPs curriculum at Aden University?

3. To what extent the educational experiences standards are available in curriculum contents of the PEFLTEP at Aden University?

4. To what extent the teaching strategies standards are available in the teaching methods used in the PEFLTEPs at Aden University?

5. To what extent the evaluation methods standard is available in the evaluation procedures used in the PEFLTEPs?

6. What is an appropriate balance among these four components: linguistic, ELT Methodology, literature and General Education?
This model consists of four major domains as follows:

The first domain, *educational purposes*, is an important part of the educational process. It assists in clarifying the relationship between the student and the educator. This domain can be divided into three types. The first type, *aims*, is a statement in broad terms like strategy concerning the overall goals, ends or intentions of teaching that describes what students are expected to learn. Aims guide students to be aware of what is expected from them and help them study important information. They are usually written in amorphous terms using words like learn, know, understand and appreciate. These words are not directly measurable. For example:

*Students will understand and become proficient in identifying the different types of spoken English.*

The second type, *goals*, is a statement of educational end or intention and is more specific than aims. Goals too may encompass an entire programme, subject area or multiple grade levels. They may be in either amorphous language or in more specific behavioral terms. For example:

*Students will be able to identify and use American slang terms and phrases.*

The third type, *Instructional or behavioural objectives*, is a statement in specific, consistent, achievable, measurable and broad learning outcomes like tactics describe what the student will be able to do as a result of engaging in a learning activity. Instructional or behavioural objectives guide for selection of content, development of an instructional strategy, development and selection of instructional
materials and construction of tests and other instruments for evaluating and also evaluating student’s instructional outcomes. In addition, Objectives are the individual stages that students must achieve on the way in order to reach these goals. Currently, most objectives are written in behavioural terms. Behavioural objectives can be divided into specific domains; cognitive (knowing), psychomotor (doing) and affective (feeling).

1. **Cognitive:** Students will be able to identify and list 6 slang terms they have heard from their peers.

2. **Psychomotor:** Students will be able to create expressive gestures to go with their favorite slang terms.

3. **Affective:** Student will be able to choose 4 of the most offensive slang terms from a list developed by the entire class.

These types of objectives are the majority of ones used in creating today’s lesson plans and they usually specify behaviour that students must demonstrate to indicate that learning has occurred.

The second domain, *educational experiences*, refers to what educators need to know about what they teach (including what they know about language teaching itself) and it constitutes knowledge that would not be shared by educators of other subject areas. Educational experiences consist of courses in language analysis, learning theory, methodology, a teaching practicum and practical skills of language teaching. They aim at evaluating and analysing content of curriculum. In addition, the resources which are available in how they use and procedures followed to revise periodically curriculum.
Educational experiences distinguish between two kinds of knowledge as follows:

**Disciplinary knowledge (DK)** is a part of professional education and does not translate into practical skills. It refers to knowledge that presents a basis for the language teaching profession. Such knowledge is acquired by special training. And possessing knowledge of this kind leads to professional recognition and status. It could include the course work in areas such as history of language teaching methods, language acquisition, sociolinguistics, phonology and syntax, discourse analysis, theories of language, critical applied linguistics and so on.

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)** is a knowledge that is drawn from the study of language teaching and language learning itself which can be applied in different ways to the resolution of practical issues in language teaching. It refers to the knowledge that provides a basis for language teaching. Moreover, it could include course work in areas such as curriculum planning, assessment, reflective teaching, classroom management, teaching children, teaching the four basic skills and so on.

**Cultural Content knowledge (CCK)** is a knowledge that provides student-teachers with general information in science education and discipline-culture structure of theory. Moreover, it could include course work in areas such as application computer, history of education, school management, philosophy and so on.

Third domain, **teaching strategies**, refers to the strategies or processes used in implementing curriculum. Teaching strategies aim to identify how well general aims are translated into actions to achieve specific learning objectives for daily lessons.
Curriculum authorities have the responsibility to look at the ways to improve the arrangement of course content and skills to be covered at all levels.

The last domain, *evaluation methods*, aims at identifying the evaluation methods used to achieve the educational objectives in which the programme’s aims are attained. Evaluation methods guide the teacher-educators to make decisions about the learning process as well as the student-teachers to get information on their progress.

In sum, the evaluation in this model is conducted at the whole programme level.

This model is tested to evaluate the effectiveness of five PEFLTEPs selected randomly out of nine colleges of education at Aden University. Data are collected from 206 fourth-year student-teachers attending the PEFLTEPs in the academic year 2012-2013 and 56 teacher-educators teaching these five programmes in the same academic year, (99) out of (103) student-teachers studying in Aden College of Education, (55) out of (66) student-teachers from Zingbar College of Education, (12) out of (28) student-teachers from Louder College of Education, (25) out of (43) student-teachers from Radfan College of Education, (15) out of (16) student-teachers from Yafea College of Education and (15) out of (18) teacher-educators from Aden College of Education. (15) out of (15) teacher-educators from Zingbar College of Education, (10) out of (11) teacher-educators from Louder College of Education, (7) out of (10) teacher-educators from Radfan College of Education and (10) out of (10) teacher-educators from Yafea College of Education. Thus, the sample of this study represents 100% of the total amount.
The data, both quantitative and qualitative, are collected through questionnaires, semi-structured interviews, open-ended questions, essay questions and content analysis. Data are analysed quantitatively using SPSS descriptive statistics and qualitatively using exploratory content analysis. The findings of the study reveal that the PEFLTEPs have some major shortcomings that need to be addressed. The shortcomings are related to the educational purposes, especially aims and objectives, educational experiences and teaching strategies of the PEFLTEPs. Aims and objectives are not clearly and specifically identified and they are not consistent with the rest of the elements of the curriculum (educational experiences, teaching strategies and evaluation methods). They are not realistic and achievable and also not broad. More specifically, the PEFLTEPs fail to realise the objectives which are related to English language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking). In terms of educational experiences, the results of the study indicate that the curriculum is not periodically revised and outdated. Disciplinary Knowledge Standard is partially available in the curriculum’s contents of the PEFLTEPs. In Disciplinary knowledge, curriculum’s contents provide the student-teachers with the knowledge of language (phonological, morphological, syntactic and/or semantic systems). In Pedagogic Content Knowledge, curriculum’s contents do not employ authentic materials in teaching such as menus, newspapers, magazines and advertisements. In Cultural Content knowledge, the PEFLTEPs curriculum’s contents do not provide the student-teachers with classroom management methods and modern theories of curriculum.

In terms of Teaching Strategies, they are found to be traditionally oriented, applying a teacher-centred approach. Moreover, the results of the study show that
Teaching Strategies do not focus on encouraging student-teachers to reflect on what they learnt and how they learnt it. The results of the study also indicate that the materials are not sufficient for all skills. Regarding Evaluation Methods, the findings of the study reveal that the evaluation does not focus on learning through various methods of evaluation such as continuous, formative and summative. In addition, Evaluation Methods do not probe the student-teachers’ abilities to demonstrate depth, flexibility and application of learning. In other words, the findings of the study show that student-teachers are extremely critical of the traditional evaluation methods used by their teacher-educators which depend on a final exam that tests rote-learned materials. The study suggests that, though the PEFLTEPs achieve some of the aims, they fail to achieve all of them as far as the student-teachers and teacher-educators are concerned.

The study concludes by making suggestions for the improvement and development of the PEFLTEPs. In addition, it proposes the evaluation model, EPEETSEM Model (Educational Purposes, Educational Experiences, Teaching Strategies and Evaluation Methods), for evaluating PEFLTEPs/PESLTEPs which can be applied and modified depending on the specifications of any given context.