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Abstract

This paper describes the development and implementation of a new Eigo Core IA and IIA listening and speaking program at J.F. Oberlin University. Firstly, it describes the rationale behind the need for an overhaul of the previous program as well as the principles that were used to guide the development of the new program. Two key elements used in the design of the program included CEFR-based descriptors and blended learning. Secondly, it reports on the processes that were undertaken for syllabus design, curriculum development and faculty development. Finally, it summarizes and reflects upon the teacher feedback on the new courses with a view to make improvements in subsequent years. The processes and recommendations will be of relevance to both language teachers working at the University, and also to those developing programs in other university language programs.

概要

本稿では、桜美林大学英語プログラム英語コア科目において行われた、リスニング・スピーキング新カリキュラムの開発と導入について論じる。まず、旧カリキュラム見直しの必要性およびCEFRの能力記述文とブレンド型学習をもとにデザインされた新カリキュラム開発の背景を論説する。次に、新カリキュラム導入のプロセスについて、カリキュラム開発、シラバスデザイン、ファカルティ・ディベロップメントの観点から詳細を報告する。最後に、担当教員からのフィードバックをもとに、次年度へ向けた改善点を総括し、桜美林大学英語プログラム改革についての本報告が、本学教員だけでなく、他大学の言語プログラム開発へ及び効果について論述する。
1. Introduction – The need for change

The Speaking and Listening Curriculum Team at J.F. Oberlin, which is composed of three full-time English Language Program (ELP) assistant professors, was charged with developing a new first-year curriculum for Eigo Core IA (Speaking and Listening Spring) and Eigo Core IIA (Speaking and Listening Fall) courses in 2013 to be ready for implementation in 2014. The previous program, which had been developed over a series of many years, had done a good job at serving our first-year students’ needs. Over time however, it became increasingly evident that there was room for improvement within the program. It was established through the feedback received at in-house faculty development (FD) sessions, anecdotal reports from teachers, and an internal analysis of the courses, that it was time for a change.

Some of the major concerns within the previous program that were identified included: a lack of consistency in the materials between the three levels; a need for a greater focus on the explicit instruction of listening skills; and, a program that could be more easily understood when seen from both within and outside the university. This paper describes the processes and challenges that the team faced in developing the new courses as well as the final curriculum that resulted. It is suggested that the contents of this paper will be of relevance to EFL course developers in other Japanese universities.

1.1 CEFR and its challenges

Being commissioned with the instruction to overhaul the program, the team believed that the first step should be to establish a cohesive set of goals that could describe what our first year students should be able to do at each level once they had completed their first year in the ELP. The Speaking and Listening Team began by referring to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) (Council of Europe 2001). The purpose of this framework is for language programs to be able to use illustrative descriptors (can do statements) to describe communicative competencies according to six levels of proficiency (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2). In order to adapt the CEFR to be more useful in the Japanese context, Tono and Negishi (2012) developed a twelve-level scale by breaking down the four A and B levels into nine levels. This was deemed to be necessary because Negishi (2011) reported that ‘... over 80% of Japanese EFL learners fall in the A1 or A2 level (Non/Basic Users), less than 20% are in the B levels (Independent Users) and almost nil are in the C
levels (Proficient Users). The Speaking and Listening Curriculum Team believed that the new framework for English teaching in Japan, known as CEFR-J, might be a good place to start for identifying the benchmarks it would use when developing a new curriculum. This, however, was not very practical because currently no commercially available textbooks adhere to the CEFR-J scale. Therefore, an unrealistic amount of time would be required to select and assign the various can do statements to the content covered in each chapter of the textbook that was to be eventually chosen. As a consequence, the team went back to referring to CEFR.

There are a number of benefits and challenges with the application of CEFR in the Japanese tertiary context. Specifically, the use of can do schemes can enhance students’ abilities to self-regulate their learning. Odwyer (2010) and Sato (2010) each report on their successful EFL programs, which have students become involved in their own learning by developing can do statements as checklists for goal-setting and self-assessment purposes. However, it would be a major challenge to obtain such a student-centered approach within the first-year program at J.F. Oberlin University. With roughly 55 part-time, 13 full-time teachers, and 90 classes of first-year students, this kind of negotiated curriculum would be nearly impossible to implement. The alternative was for the Speaking and Listening Team to decide on all of the can do statements for the program. Nagai and Odwyer (2011) warn against such a top-down approach whereby teachers feel a lack of autonomy because it often results in indifference to reform among a program’s instructors. Nagai and Odwyer also note that to combat this, the challenge is to strive for an ’amalgam of top-down and bottom-up approaches so that teachers can adapt to CEFR and share its basic philosophy and ideas (20011, p.146).’ This was to be the challenge of the ELP going forward. Ultimately, the Speaking and Listening Team decided it was necessary to select textbooks and materials that were carefully developed in accordance with CEFR levels and can do statements, and to try to engage with teachers on how these principles are guiding the new listening and speaking courses.

1.2 Blended learning considerations

In recent times, we have seen a shift in the perceptions of traditional computer-assisted language learning (CALL) to a more flexible delivery mode, referred to as ‘blended learning’ (Hinkelman, 2005, p.17). With blended learning, there is a merging of the two traditionally separated learning environments of the face-to-face classroom and the
computer-equipped language laboratory. The technological infrastructure at J.F. Oberlin University is well equipped to serve the needs of our “digital native” learners and, to varying degrees, computer-savvy instructors. Each classroom is equipped with a computer installed on the teacher’s console, and there is Wi-Fi accessibility throughout the campus. Within the ELP, teachers are already familiar with the Learner Management Software (LMS) Moodle, and the use of other third-party applications and websites to facilitate language learning is encouraged.

Likewise, there has been a response to the shift toward blended learning in teaching practices by publishers in the ways in which they develop and market their EFL materials to complement their textbooks (Kobayashi & Little, 2011, p.103). The importance of student perceptions on how teachers incorporate CALL in the L2 classroom is well documented. In Hong and Samimy’s (2010) study of Korean EFL collegiate learners, students showed more positive attitudes toward the use of CALL modes as their perceived teachers’ active involvement in using CALL modes increased (p.12). This of course could be seen as overly demanding to teaching staff who might feel that they do not have enough time out of class to be actively monitoring discussion boards and uploading materials to an LMS. It was also a real possibility that there might be a few teachers who are reluctant to utilize technology in their classes at all. The choice of materials and the ways in which blended learning was going to be implemented in the new ELP speaking and listening classes was paramount to the level of success of the program. McCarthy (1994, p.11) contends that, “Any piece of CALL software represents a balance between the technology, the linguistic content, and pedagogy.” It was clear that both teachers’ and students’ attitudes toward using technology in the L2 classroom had to be considered when deciding on the new course materials.

2. Guiding principles for materials selection

Considering the gravity of such a major curriculum overhaul, it was important to establish a clear set of criteria to be used for assessing potential course materials. Samples of textbooks and materials were requested for submission from publishers on the proviso that the books were essentially developed for speaking and listening courses (since the ELP already has a separate reading and writing program, four-skills course materials were not included in the selection process). The main criteria for evaluation were as follows:
1. CEFR and *can do* statements: Both of these were seen as being necessary to ensure that the program had functional and communicative goals for our students. Many publishers currently state the CEFR level of a given textbook, but not many of them have specific descriptors and *can do* statements within the books themselves.

2. Level appropriateness: The materials had to be leveled in such a way as to match each of the three levels of ELP’s first-year students.

3. Blended learning possibilities: Wherever possible, it was desirable to exploit the technology that students have available to them as well as the technological infrastructure that J. F. Oberlin has already made available to staff and students. Materials that could be hosted on Moodle and accessed on mobile devices were looked upon favorably. Conversely, content that requires access to publisher-developed platforms was seen to be a hurdle for Joho Systems and the ELP did not want to become ‘locked in’ to one particular system that would be hard to break away from if needed in the future. Finally, it was important that teachers who are less inclined to use Moodle would still be able to play video and audio from the teacher’s computer in each classroom.

4. Interesting and relevant content: Aside from motivational theory, in economic terms alone, there is a recognized need for a shift toward global education in Japan because of its large-scale movement of industry overseas. In the short term, Kobayashi (2014) frames Japan’s urgent need for global education as being because, “Japanese employees often lack English language skills and cultural sensitivity when working with people outside Japan.” The new content had to be meaningful to students so that they could see the benefits of developing their English skills for now and in the future.

While these were the main criteria used to assess candidate materials, a more comprehensive list of all the factors used was compiled in a checklist format (see Appendix 1). Out of an initial eight potential titles, a short-list of four candidate materials was decided upon. Each team member independently assessed the short-listed materials to prepare for internal decision-making meetings.

Based on the pre-described criteria, the material chosen by the Speaking and Listening Team was the *World Link* series by Cengage Learning. (Stempleski, Douglas, & Morgan 2011).
2. Syllabus design and curriculum development

The Speaking and Listening Team discussed and agreed on what a balanced set of three levels would like using *World Link*, and the curriculum for the two 15-week semesters was planned out. The team summarized all of the relevant course contents and planning documents into tables, which were then printed onto A1-sized posters for FD sessions (see Appendix 2). When deciding on curriculum and assessment, it was important to maintain some continuity with previous years’ courses wherever possible to assist teachers with the transition into the new materials. The two speaking tasks were kept to basically the same format with minor changes to the content to reflect the new topics covered in the courses. The notebook task also remained the same. The major changes to the assessment were the new set of five quizzes and the contents of the paper-based assessment.

A major change to the courses is the fact that students now have a regular textbook and a video textbook. As the title, *World Link*, suggests, there is a global emphasis put on the contents of the materials, and the actors who feature in the videos are from a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

2.1 CEFR and can do statements

The *World Link* materials are well suited to the three ELP core levels (ELP Level 1 - CEF A1; ELP Level 2 - CEF A1-A2; ELP Level 3 - CEF B1). Whilst the sequence and scope pages of the textbook do not specifically state each descriptor as a *can do* statement, the support materials for instructors have clearly set out descriptors. Furthermore, the speaking strategies and grammar focus for each chapter are clearly summarized in the back of the student book.

2.2 Course delivery and technology

The publisher, Cengage Learning, was very supportive and helpful with all matters relating to information technology, specifically their support staff provided:

- A site license for the Interactive Presentation Tool (electronic textbook) so that it could be installed on all ELP-classroom teachers’ computers.
- Moodle templates of all *World Link* video courses, practice quizzes and online workbook ready for ELP staff to add content to.
- All textbook audio files and audio scripts in digital format.
- Time for meetings with J.F. Oberlin’s Joho Systems to troubleshoot technical
difficulties. All issues were always followed-up by email.

Finally, J.F. Oberlin’s Joho Systems Department worked very hard on getting the new templates and courses ready, and without the support of a such an efficient and supportive IT department, no such program reform could ever take place.

3. Faculty development

Preparing instructors for the new courses involved a lot of planning. The Speaking and Listening Team had to ensure that there was sufficient time to prepare the courses and engage with the instructors as much as possible before and after they were launched.

3.1 Timing

It was essential to get instructors prepared for the course changes as early as possible. In November 2013 in the semester before implementing the changes, the Speaking and Listening Team displayed the A1-sized posters (Appendix 2) explaining the new courses in the Teachers’ Lounge. This was followed up by daily lunchtime explanation sessions for a week at the end of November. Instructors were given copies of the textbooks and they were introduced to the sample Moodle courses into which Joho Systems had enrolled them. This gave instructors five months to preview the curriculum and material before the new courses began in April 2014. Instructors were also given a more detailed explanation of the new courses at the compulsory ELP teachers’ orientation.

3.2 Feedback sessions

During week 7 (June 2-6) of the spring semester in 2014, teachers were invited to drop into lunchtime feedback sessions to provide feedback on the new courses (Appendix 3). Some 32 teachers attended at least one of the voluntary sessions, and most of the feedback focused on the newest element of the course, the Video Textbook. Reflection on any educational training courses is an important part of the teaching and learning process.

One example of useful feedback coming out of this process was where some teachers were concerned that the first of the videos, Good Morning World, was not engaging enough for their students, while others did not seem to mind it. In response to this, from next year, teachers will be able to choose any two of the three videos they wish to use. A number of
teachers also said that they found the question style and format for the video was too repetitive and more variety in the activities is required. This information has been forwarded to the publisher for any future editions. For now, we recommend that teachers exploit the variety of teaching approaches to video that are explained in the back of the teacher’s manual. This feedback process has also identified the need for future in-house FD training on teaching listening. Finally, another set of feedback sessions is planned for the end of the second semester.

4. Recommendations for the future

Going forward, the ELP Speaking and Listening Team plans to more concretely integrate the can do statements into the curriculum materials. One of the ideas currently being discussed includes holding an FD session for all ELP staff. In groups, instructors could work on making rubrics for speaking tasks and checklists for students to use for self-assessment. Now that the top-down decisions have been made, a more bottom-up approach is required so that teachers can adapt to CEFR and share in its basic philosophy and ideas. Furthermore, student feedback on the program should be taken on board when refining the courses in years to come.

5. Conclusion

This paper has described the development and implementation of a renewed first-year listening and speaking course at J.F. Oberlin University. Over all, the process undertaken was highly successful and so far the new courses are currently running smoothly. This paper has also addressed some of the limitations of trying to build a curriculum based on can do statements relating to CEFR, and more recently, CEFR-J. Based on this experience, it is advisable for curriculum developers who want to base their courses on CEFR principles to carefully select already published materials for the Japanese EFL learner. Furthermore, publishers should be able to clearly show how their materials were created in line with the CEFR levels and descriptors. The use of blended learning is believed to enhance language learning, however technology is only ever as good as the IT departments who support the
teaching and learning within an institution. Finally, to achieve success with introducing any new program, ongoing faculty development is of utmost importance.
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Appendix 1: Textbook evaluation sheet for listening & speaking courses 2014

Textbook name & publisher: ___________________________  Reviewed for Level: _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overarching principles</th>
<th>Unsuitable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CEFR levels clearly stated</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can-do statements already included</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate to our students’ levels</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Unsuitable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting/motivating for our students</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (15*2 semesters of work)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of blended learning</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough communicative activities</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Package components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package components</th>
<th>Unsuitable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary materials</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia support</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s book</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes/test creating component</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skills focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills focus</th>
<th>Unsuitable</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/writing (less is best)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, how suitable is this book for Obirin ELP purposes?
Appendix 2: Faculty development posters

### Speaking & Listening Curriculum

**FROM SPRING 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment 1</th>
<th>Assessment 2</th>
<th>Assessment 3</th>
<th>Assessment 4</th>
<th>Assessment 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Task 1</td>
<td>Speaking Task 2</td>
<td>Quizzes: Best 4 of 5*</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Expressions</td>
<td>Notebook &amp; Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA according to level</td>
<td>TBA according to level</td>
<td>Based on 4 quizzes</td>
<td>4 units per semester (1-4 Spr.; 5-9 Fall)</td>
<td>English use, participation, and journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20% 20% 20% 20% 20%

### Textbook

#### What has to be covered?

- Vocabulary Link
- Pronunciation
- Speaking
- Language Link
- Communication

*NB: A major goal of the new course is to increase the amount of listening done in class - ideally 50% of the class time should be spent on listening*

---

### Students will have 2 textbooks!

#### Why are we changing to World Link?
- allows the ELP to have a unified curriculum across all 3 levels
- has better focus on listening skills
- is leveled according to CEFR
- has the benefits of teaching with video
- has better variety of materials (instructioanl and supplementary)

#### What units of the Text do we have to cover?
- Spring: Units 1-4 (Unit 5 optional)
- Fall: Units 6-9 (Unit 10 optional)

#### What is the purpose of the Video Textbook?
- reinforces the language/topics in textbook
- promotes motivation

#### Lesson Planner-Teacher’s book:
- Lesson plans
- Answer keys
- Audio scripts...

#### Textbook

#### Supplementary activities:
- Extra communication activities
- PDFs in Shared Files

#### Interactive Presentation Tool (IPT):
- Software installed on Gakujikan class PCs
- Electronic version of student book
- Audio, answers etc

#### Online workbook:
- On Moodle
- Extra practice (at home)

#### Audio: MP3s
- Shared Files & On Moodle
- On Interactive Presentation Tool

#### Audio scripts
- Shared Files
- In Word & PDF
Appendix 2: Faculty development posters (cont.)

Video Textbook

- Video 1: Good Morning World
  - Morning talk-show format
  - A little cheesy, but stimulates interest
  - Useful to model interviews / discussions
  - To be covered in class

- Video 2: City Living
  - Sitcom format
  - 6 young people from various of international backgrounds
  - Sets up motivating role-plays
  - To be covered in class

- Video 3: Global Viewpoints
  - Real-life interviews with students / business people
  - Issues / topics relating to unit theme
  - Optional

Lesson Planner
- Teacher’s book
- Lesson plans
- Video scripts

Interactive Presentation Tool (IPT)
- Software installed on Gakujikan class PCs
- Electronic version

Teacher’s Guide
- Lesson summaries
- Video scripts
- Answers
- Video worksheets are here, too, but don’t have to be copied since students have textbooks

* Students & teachers do not have physical DVDs

Speaking Tasks 1 & 2: 20% each

Goal-focused
Speaking Tasks should test students’ use of the target skills and forms of the following units:
- Spring Task 1: Units 1 & 2
- Spring Task 2: Units 3 & 4
- Fall Task 1: Units 6 & 7
- Fall Task 2: Units 8 & 9

Teachers can decide on format
For example:
- Mini-talk & interview
- Group discussion
- Role-play
- Ski
- Speech
- Presentation

Assessment Task 3: Notebooks: 20%

Assessment Task 3: Quizzes (5% each x 4)
A Quiz is given after students complete one unit of the textbook.
Quizzes cover the following areas:
- Listening skills
- Vocabulary & expressions
- Grammar

Each quiz focuses on the target skills/forms of the unit.
*Quiz 3 is a make-up quiz that covers all four units of the semester. Teachers have to give it to all students and use only their four best scores when assigning quiz grades.

Assessment Task 4: Listening & Expressions (20%)
Given toward the end of the semester.
Covers the following areas:
- Listening skills
- Vocabulary & expressions
- Grammar

Covers the skills/forms learned in all four required units of the semester.
### Appendix 3: Summary of teacher feedback on new 2014 Spring Speaking and Listening courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Instructor feedback</th>
<th>Speaking &amp; Listening Team response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Listening</td>
<td>I find the video activities have too many gap-fills and not enough variety.</td>
<td>This is a good point. Please read the various strategies of how to teach listening using video in the Instructor’s Manual. We can also hold a future FD session on teaching listening with the materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Listening</td>
<td>The listening is challenging, but I like it. Students who have overseas experience tend to do better.</td>
<td>Yes. It appears we have achieved a greater focus on teaching listening. We will continue to support the speaking with supplementary materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Listening</td>
<td>The (increased) amount of listening in <em>World Link</em> is good. As teachers, it’s easy supplement the speaking as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>Could we get a simplified version of the answers to the Video Workbook?</td>
<td>Agreed. We will work on having one ready for next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>The videos are well contextualized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>The students prefer the City Living video to Good Morning World.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>The Good Morning World video is too contrived and corny.</td>
<td>This is all good feedback. Next year we will let teachers decide which two of the three videos to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>My students enjoy Good Morning World.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>We (teachers) would prefer to use the last video, Global Viewpoints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video Textbook: Content</td>
<td>More variety in the video activities is needed. They are not very engaging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Summary of teacher feedback on new 2014 Spring Speaking and Listening courses (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Instructor feedback</th>
<th>Speaking &amp; Listening Team response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td>The textbook is not communicative enough.</td>
<td>The textbook is designed so as not to have too many blank spaces for students to fill in. Please feel free to use the supplementary communicative activities in Shared Files.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The textbook is mostly good for listening, grammar and the language summaries.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A nice feature of the textbook is how the grammar, vocabulary and speaking strategies are summarized in the back.</td>
<td>Yes. These are particularly useful for setting up speaking tasks and reviewing for quizzes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Level 2 listening is very easy (too short) in the textbook.</td>
<td>Please try using a variety of global listening strategies such as note taking and dictogloss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>My students’ quiz scores are all too high. The grammar on the quizzes is too easy. Of course students can’t produce it, but they can find the right answer on a quiz.</td>
<td>Thank you. Let’s see how they fare over a year and compare to other classes. We can increase the difficulty if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>The Interactive Presentation Tool on the teacher’s computer is good</td>
<td>So far these tools are being well received by both teachers and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s good how students can access the videos on Moodle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>