

PACIFIC REGIONAL TVET & NFE SYMPOSIUM 2011

Guiding English TVET Teaching Reforms Against The Rising Tide Of Urgency In A Pacific Small Island State

Maria Doyle

Senior ESL Education Manager,
Kiribati Institute of Technology/ TVET Sector Strengthening Project, Kiribati

and

Mr Antoine Barnaart

Principal, Kiribati Institute of Technology and
Deputy Team Leader TVET Sector Strengthening Project, Kiribati

INTRODUCTION

The Kiribati Institute of Technology (KIT) is an important TVET institution in Kiribati which has the key responsibility for providing high quality TVET courses and qualifications in a broad range of discipline areas for I-Kiribati. Since mid-2009, KIT has been undergoing major reforms and from 2010 has been a significant partner in the 5 year AusAID funded Kiribati TVET Sector Strengthening Program (TVETSSP). This program has the long term strategic goal of providing increased and equitable employment for I-Kiribati locally, regionally and internationally. An equally important goal is to increase options for school leavers and drop outs to enter into vocational education to achieve decent work for all and to stimulate economic growth.

These goals will ensure that I-Kiribati can maximize their work options and, if necessary, settle and work in other countries with choice and dignity, should the predicted and dramatic effects of global warming impact on the country in the near future. To realize these goals, I-Kiribati not only need high quality and internationally recognized technical skills but they also need English language proficiency well above the current level of the average I-Kiribati in order to successfully engage with internationally recognised training.

English language proficiency is a core skill, however, it is often treated as an 'add-on' when reforming TVET courses, qualifications and whole institutions. KIT, as part of TVETSSP, has taken an innovative approach by integrating English into the core of every program and work plan for each staff and student. This has made English language proficiency central to all training at KIT and essential for counterpart capacity building.

Determining learner and long term needs

In designing the English program for KIT, it was necessary to work towards the outputs, objectives and targets of the TVETSSP, and within the cultural and contextual constraints that the local educational profile and history presented.

In Phase 1 of the TVETSSP, the position of Senior ESL Education Manager (SEEM) was created to provide on-the-ground expertise and ensure the outputs and targets related to English language proficiency were achievable. The TVETSSP Design gives clear instructions with Output 2.1 *'The competence of KIT trainers and support staff members is improved'*, *'All KIT trainers are proficient in English at an IELTS score of 5 or equivalent'*, and *'100% of KIT full time courses are delivered to Australian Quality standards by 2013'*¹. Combining these expected outcomes with those of the SEEM role, it was clear that the overall target was to increase the levels of English language proficiency of all staff and students at KIT so as to enable full engagement with Australian Quality Training Framework(AQTF) compliant curriculum and assessment. Achieving this has also ensured that I-Kiribati counterparts have had the best opportunity to participate in all other TVETSSP activities.

To create an English program that would cater to the needs of the learners, reflect best practice course design² and be sustainable, it was decided to spend initial months observing, planning and gathering information which would ultimately sculpt the policies, curriculum and approaches underpinning the program. This profiling information included but was not restricted to: age range, mother tongue characteristics, target language levels target professions and or academic environments, learners' target situation (language skills needed in target profession), curriculum and approaches already used in primary, secondary and tertiary education, educational history, other course and cultural commitments, students perceptions of their own experience and key cultural conventions surrounding language use and how cultural conventions could affect the language learning environment.

The information was gathered through observation, pilot English classes, questionnaires and discussion. Key findings were:

- students were either being prepared for either traditional trades (electrical, automotive and construction) or non-trade courses (accounting and business);
- most students had completed at least Form 5 (Junior Secondary School);
- most staff had completed either Cert IV TAA and/or Certificate II in their respective trade areas;
- there was a strong English presence in primary and secondary schools until the late 1970s when oral and aural use of English declined even though most texts including assessments are still produced in English;
- 'mocking', albeit a crucial part of Kiribati disciplinary culture, would be the strongest reason why staff and students would be reluctant to speak or engage in training delivered in English;
- singing, dancing and performing is a stand-out characteristic in the Kiribati culture, as is the propensity for dependent learning styles.

¹ (2009). *TVETSSP Project Design Document*. AusAID.

² Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning Lessons and Courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

These findings, combined with the practicalities of timetable restrictions, the proportion of a learner's timetable that could be dedicated to English language classes, and a review of existing TVET English language programs, helped inform future policy, curriculum design and teaching and learning approaches.

Researching TVET English language programs

The investigation of TVET English language programs was an essential and productive exercise. Language schools in Australia catering to multicultural cohorts have traditionally used 'grammar based' syllabi, utilising ready-made courses at various levels, available from leading English language publishers like Cambridge, Oxford and Pearson Longman; examples of these courses include 'Face to Face'³ and 'Headway'⁴. These syllabi tend not to suit a Pacific context in that the topics and content are not relevant to an isolated island state, and although the grammar base is a necessary component of a balanced English language program, as a stand-alone course it would not have addressed the vocational or industry specific vocabulary or skills needed in the learners' target profession or educational situation.

Functional and situational syllabi (those focusing on functions such as 'inviting or apologizing', and situations such as 'at the store' or 'at the doctor')⁵, have been previously used in the Pacific; at the Marine Training Centre in Tarawa, Kiribati, a proportion of the English language foundation course revolves around the situations and functions graduate sea-men will need on board ships and in transit. Considering the wide range of target situations and functions needed in addressing the KIT cohort of various trades and business courses, creating this type of syllabus, at a range of levels, was not a viable alternative.

NSW AMES, or the New South Wales Adult Migrant English Service, has, since 1992 developed CSWE, or the Certificates of Spoken and Written English, which are based on a 'text based' syllabus design meaning that modules are linked to learners being able to engage with and gain meaning from whole texts; this can be referred to as a 'mixed syllabus' type as it combines elements of various different previously described syllabus types. It is the responsibility of a course designer to select modules that cater to the needs of the learners and sequence the elements in a systematic way⁶.

According to Feez and Joyce⁷, 'in Australia, the most widely used adult TESOL curriculum framework is the *Certificates in Spoken and Written English (CSWE)*...CSWE is an ESL curriculum framework which covers four levels of language learning' and caters for general through to vocational and further study contexts; it also covers all the macro skills and is competency based, incorporating assessable learning outcomes for module.

³Published by Cambridge;

http://www.cambridge.org/us/esl/catalog/subject/project/item404363/face2face/?site_locale=en_US¤tSubjectID=382378

⁴Published by Oxford University Press; <http://elt.oup.com/student/headway/?cc=global&selLanguage=en>

⁵Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow : Pearson Education Limited.

⁶Feez, S., and Joyce, H. (2006). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

⁷Feez, S., and Joyce, H. (2006). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

The Australian Certificates are accredited by the Australian Skills Quality Authority with the qualifications or statements of attainment aligning with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF). According to the AMES CSWE curriculum documents⁸ the CSWEs are 'used widely through Australia in the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP), the Adult and Community Education (ACE) sector, TAFE colleges, university language programs, Indigenous education, corrective services programs, private language colleges and Intensive English Centres (IECs) in NSW state schools.'

The CSWEs are widely used by service providers of the AMEP (Adult Migrant Education Program), which is a migrant settlement program provided by the Australian Government and administered through the Department of Immigration and Citizenship. The NCELTR (National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, based at Macquarie University) also produced an online, moderated assessment task bank, which was created with the help of staff from numerous institutions delivering the CSWE Australia wide.

Curriculum Design

Taking into consideration the data collected in the initial needs analysis, it was decided that to be able to deliver to the requirements of the TVETSSP PDD and needs of the KIT cohort, that a mixed syllabus type would be implemented at KIT. This involved combining the grammar and topic based course 'English Unlimited'⁹, with CSWE courses at an appropriate level.

'English Unlimited' was chosen as the base text, as a grammar based course was needed that would be appropriate for the Kiribati context; the newest text book course published by Cambridge University Press is both 'practical' and 'international' which is what many grammar based courses lack.¹⁰ The course is 'practical' in that it revolves around achieving goals that are linked to the 'Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEF)' and are directly linkable to CSWE outcomes. It is 'international' in that it uses universally appropriate topics, texts and tasks, and does not assume knowledge of celebrity culture, but focuses on the skills learners require to be 'effective communicators in international contexts'¹¹. It also provides a systematic approach to covering the grammar and vocabulary areas that were identified as lacking in those who graduated from the Kiribati Primary and Secondary Education system.

Appropriate CSWE modules were identified for each of the staff and student cohorts after thorough consultation with all relevant stakeholders, which resulted in the KIT ELDP (English Language Development Plan). From the KIT ELDP, course planners can then be constructed for each cohort, which include the CSWE modules inserted into appropriate places along the specified 'English Unlimited' syllabus. In this way, KIT English trainers are able to design and implement courses that cater for the cohorts' grammar needs as well as working towards developing skills in using and producing texts that are appropriate to their target profession or industry areas. Below (Figure 1), is an example of a typical one year CSWE II course planner for first year trades students at KIT.

⁸ AMES, N. (2008). *Certificates I-IV in Spoken and Written English*. Surry Hills: NSW Adult Migrant English Service.

⁹ Published by Cambridge: http://www.cambridge.org/us/esl/catalog/subject/project/item5629547/english-unlimited/?site_locale=en_US

¹⁰ (2010). *The thinking behind English Unlimited*. Retrieved November 01, 2011, from Cambridge.org: http://www.cambridge.org/servlet/file/EnglishUnlimited_LALL_PED_Methodology.pdf?ITEM_ENT_ID=5632970&COLLSPEC_ENT_ID=594

¹¹ (2010). *The thinking behind English Unlimited*. Retrieved November 01, 2011, from Cambridge.org: http://www.cambridge.org/servlet/file/EnglishUnlimited_LALL_PED_Methodology.pdf?ITEM_ENT_ID=5632970&COLLSPEC_ENT_ID=594

Figure 1: Typical KIT CSWE II Course Planner.

CSWE II and English Unlimited ELEMENTARY																
EU	Intro	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
CSWE	H ₁				H ₂						J		F/I	F/I		D
	A (Independent Learning)						N (Numeracy and Problem Solving)									
<i>CSWE Modules: A: Independent Learning, D: Presentations, F: Spoken Instructions, H: Forms, I: Written Instructions, J: Emails, N: Numeracy</i>																

By integrating identified needs specific CSWE modules into a thorough, reputable grammar based program, learners are exposed to a mixed syllabus appropriate to their needs; including but not restricted to the functions, situations, texts and grammar that are appropriate to their industry area and target profession or workplace. The CSWE also provide an opportunity to use a reputable, nationally developed and accepted syllabus that has been in development for nearly twenty years, with moderated, adaptable and reliable assessment tasks and procedures, enabling completion with nationally accredited Australian qualifications.

Strategies supporting the Curriculum

In an institution where English is not the primary language, if exposure to English only occurs in an 'English class' classroom, the expected improvement in English language proficiency among staff and students must be equally as limited. According to many theories of language learning, the more authentic language situations a learner can be exposed to, the higher chance that learner has of increasing proficiency in the language; for this reason, LLN strategies and policies that would reinforce a positive attitude towards working towards an English speaking campus were encouraged.

Knowing that to be AQTF compliant, 80% of classes must be conducted in English, and considering that all curriculum and equipment for Australian courses introduced at KIT would be in English, it was decided that KIT staff and students needed to work towards speaking English the majority of the time; in classrooms and on campus.

Figure 2: 'Working towards an English Speaking Campus' strategy released to KIT staff and students in October 2010.

<i>On campus, in classrooms, under the tree, whenever you are at KIT...</i>	Senior Management to ALL	Staff to Staff (as much as possible)	Staff to Students (as much as possible)	Students to Students (as much as possible)
Until now	English	Kiribati	Kiribati	Kiribati
2010-2011	English	English	English Kiribati	English Kiribati
2012	English	English	English	English

In July 2010, after much discussion with KIT staff and students, the 'Working towards an English Speaking campus' strategy was released. The general feeling among staff and students was that they were not quite ready to change KIT into an English speaking campus, and would need time to improve their language skills before it could become a reality. For this reason, the strategy was released which encouraged staff and students to use as much English as possible on campus and in classrooms, with the understanding that as an institute, we would be working towards an English speaking campus in 2012.

In support of this strategy, a 'no mocking' understanding was agreed among staff and students in regards to the use of English. Staff and students agreed that the Kiribati cultural norm of mocking others would not aid in the development of their language skills and therefore, class by class, discussions were held. An agreement was made that 'mocking' was an important part of Kiribati culture and therefore welcomed and enjoyed, unless it was to do with the use of English.

Other support was provided in the form of regular English classes, community events like debating and lunch time grammar classes and English movies. Staff and students also had access to a Graded Reader Library complete with 7 levels of books, audio CDs, worksheets and answer keys. Eighty % of KIT staff joined the Graded Reader Library within weeks of its arrival and the staff are still avid borrowers of the books and their supplementary materials. Because KIT does not have the quantity of readers available to enable student borrowing, KIT English trainers are using the readers in class as supplementary texts, whole class activities, and for individuals finishing assessments or classwork before the end of their class.

Creating an English speaking campus was, for KIT, a multi-layered approach, rather than a policy or syllabus type working in isolation to increase English language proficiency. It was the combination of the policy and the syllabus type, together with resources, events and collaborative support from staff and students that laid the foundation for the approaches to training and the training itself to be as successful as possible: in classes and across the campus.

Embedding the Linguistic Approaches

The basis of the 'Working towards an English Speaking Campus' strategy, was that students and staff felt motivated and encouraged to use English, because they knew that in doing so, it would ultimately help them to be gaining Australian standard qualifications; this also formed the basis of the approaches and methodologies¹² taken to language learning in classrooms and on campus.

There are a number of approaches and methods currently and historically used in the ESL classroom, and deciding which one to use often depends on the target cohort and target outcomes¹³; i.e. motivated 18 years old Japanese students preparing for grammar exams would benefit from a different approach to that taken for disenfranchised 18 year olds in an indigenous youth offender program. KIT provided a

¹² Approaches are 'the conditions which will promote successful language learning', and methods 'the practical realization of an approach' (Harmer, 2007); for the purpose of this paper, they will be referred to interchangeably as is often the case in ESL texts.

¹³ Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2011). *The Teaching Knowledge Test Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

unique challenge in that the learners have been exposed to English throughout their primary and secondary education at a written level, and in the community through local and imported audio and visual media. Therefore, learners often presented as ‘false beginners’, with high levels of vocabulary and reading comprehension, but with noticeable gaps in the ability to produce written or oral English with any grammatical accuracy.

Learners also presented with a certain reticence towards English classes; the initial needs analysis showed that English classes learners had been previously exposed to tended to be of the ‘grammar-translation’ type being teacher centred and relying heavily on translation of key points in Kiribati language, with aged text books and teachers whose level of communicative, current usage English was less than desirable.

Breaking with that tradition, the overall approaches taken at KIT are the ‘Communicative’ and ‘Content Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)’ Approaches. The view of language in the Communicative Approach is that ‘communication is the most important aspect of language. Meaning is communicated through functions, grammar, vocabulary, discourse and skills’; and that the view of language learning is, ‘the best way to learn language is to use it in **interaction**, rather than to learn about it.’ Classroom practices in this approach are characterized by¹⁴:

- ‘a syllabus (which) focuses on tasks, functions and topic areas based on learners’ communicative needs’;
- ‘pair and group work (enabling) lots of interaction’;
- ‘fluency (being) more important than accuracy’;
- ‘authentic materials’;
- ‘learners (becoming) active users of the language’;
- ‘the teacher’s role (focusing) particularly on setting up communicative activities’.

CLIL is similar to the Communicative Approach, in that it language is learnt by using it as opposed to learning about it. CLIL takes this one step further and refers to learning language through (school) subjects like automotive, electro-technology or construction; ‘the specific kinds of language learnt are the language needed for learning about the subject’¹⁵.

All KIT trainers, as KIT becomes an English speaking campus, will need to be CLIL trainers as they are facilitating the learning of subjects that are delivered in their learners’ second language. These approaches suited the mixed syllabus chosen to incorporate the grammar, functions, texts and tasks appropriate to the learners’ target professions, whilst encouraging a student centred, practical, motivating and communicative philosophy towards language and language learning at KIT.

To encourage the essence behind the CLIL and Communicative Approaches at KIT, all KIT staff were allocated dedicated English and professional development time in their work-plans. English language classes revolved around CSWE IV (Employment), Workplace Communication stream, and modules

¹⁴ Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2011). *The Teaching Knowledge Test Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

¹⁵ Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2011). *The Teaching Knowledge Test Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

including 'Learning Strategies for Workplace Training', and Language Skills for 'Workplace Presentations', 'Workplace meetings', were the focus.

Professional development sessions incorporated basic facilitation skills sessions focusing on methods, procedures and techniques employed by 'Communicative' and CLIL facilitators, and often the English and professional development time were integrated as the content was so closely related. English trainers were also given the opportunity to study the Certificate IV in TESOL from TAFESA, under the guidance of a Short Term Advisor in-country for 12 weeks. Their training continues under the SEEM and will be completed by the end of 2012.

Proficiency testing

Part of the TVETSSP design included English language testing for staff and students for the purposes of tracking language development and also to ascertain proficiency levels of KIT trainers and their ability to comply with the AQTF. For this purpose, International English Language Testing System (IELTS) testing was one of the outputs in the original PDD and was programmed twice yearly for all staff and students at KIT. Considering the the level of funds allocated for testing and knowing that the purpose of the testing was for benchmarking and program monitoring purposes, other testing systems were investigated to ascertain whether IELTS would be the most appropriate testing system.

Another internationally registered testing system being used in the Pacific and in Kiribati on other AusAID funded projects, is the International Second Language Proficiency Ratings (ISLPR). It was decided to compare the two systems and ascertain which would be more appropriate for the Kiribati TVET system, as all other internationally recognised testing systems like TOEFL¹⁶, TOEIC¹⁷, FCE¹⁸ and CAE¹⁹ were not considered appropriate after due investigation.

The nature of ISLPR and IELTS vary considerably although they both seek to rate a candidates performance on the four macro skills of speaking, listening, reading and writing. Wylie (2007) describes the difference in origins as:

'Development of the ISLPR began in 1978. The first version of the scale (originally called ASLPR) was developed by a Queensland Working Party led by David Ingram and Elaine Wylie, with a Steering Committee composed of representatives of Commonwealth (Immigration and Education) and State (Education) departments ... Development of IELTS began in 1987. The development team was based at the University of Lancaster. It consisted of three applied linguists, two British – Charles Alderson and Caroline Clapham – and one Australian – David Ingram. There was a Steering Committee composed of representatives from the UK and Australia.'

For the purposes of whether IELTS or ISLPR is more appropriate for the TVET environment in Kiribati, differing factors such as test development, authenticity of tasks, and test administration were taken into consideration. In terms of test development;

¹⁶ TOEFL: Test of English as Foreign Language

¹⁷ TOEIC: Test of English for International Communication

¹⁸ FCE: First Certificate English

¹⁹ CAE: Certificate of Advanced English

'ISLPR testing is adaptive, or custom built, to the individual candidate. Speaking, listening and reading are judged in a one-to-one interview. With writing, a number of candidates may do the test in the same room at the same time, but generally they will have different tasks. There is a high level of standardisation in the IELTS testing process. Listening, reading and writing are common tests, administered en masse. Speaking is tested one-to-one and the tester chooses from a range of tasks provided.' (Wylie, 2007)

Similarly, the tasks and content within ISLPR testing tasks are authentic, unedited and relevant to the learner's profession whereas IELTS texts are usually based on authentic texts but either edited or reformulated for enmasse testing purposes. Similarly for test administration, whereas ISLPR testing is one-to-one in nature, with three macro skills tested during a real-life, relevant conversation, IELTS tests are mass produced, delivered enmasse, and even in the speaking interview, no subjective comments or prompts allowed. Therefore, in a nation where world view and access to media is limited, a testing system which allows the content and delivery of tasks to be adaptable to the candidate's profession and home environment, naturally delivered in a one-to-one conversation, and as authentic as possible in terms of task, delivery and assessment, is much more likely to yield results that are indicative of the candidates' true ability. ISLPR can therefore be considered more appropriate for the Kiribati TVET environment in terms of ascertaining levels of proficiency and gauging improvement as when using ISLPR 'in the context of proficiency assessment, the aim is to develop tests which will inform us about the candidates' ability to use the language in real-life situations.' (Ingram, 2003).

In terms of sustainability, there are a number of financial considerations for KIT to consider when employing a testing system. ISLPR, per candidate, is at least half the cost of IELTS, and there is also scope for KIT to become an ISLPR testing centre, which is financially and in a pragmatic sense not possible with IELTS. With a limited budget, KIT is able to engage ISLPR trainers to up-skill local counterparts to be able to carry out testing, under license from, and moderated by, a registered ISLPR company²⁰ in Australia. In this way, KIT could in fact set the benchmark for English language proficiency, levels and testing in the Pacific, whilst raising revenue and the profile of Kiribati, the ability of Kiribati counterparts, and TVET in the Pacific.

²⁰ ISLPR Language Services Pty Ltd owners are the authors of the ISLPR and own the corresponding intellectual property and trade mark.

OUTCOMES AT KIT

This innovative approach to increasing English language proficiency has already achieved measurable outcomes and has also contributed to a significant transformation in the working lives of trainers, administration staff and students at KIT. They have been able to engage more fully with technical aspects of the new curriculum, whilst increasing their confidence and ability to facilitate learning in classes.

It has been the catalyst for a dramatic increase in their ability to deliver and receive training, and is evidenced by all KIT staff, within the project's first 18 months, being willing and motivated to adopt a language policy for KIT which will make English the primary language of instruction and communication on campus. The policy was formally approved by the KIT Senior Leadership Team and implemented throughout the Institute in October 2011. Within days of the policy being endorsed, 22 of 26 staff, including all trainers and administration staff, agreed to use English as the primary means of instruction and communication on campus.

Those trainers whose English is still developing, have been the most eager to sign the policy as there is a provision in the policy for those in need, to have ITNALP²¹s created in collaboration with the English Department, and they are eager to begin doing the extra work needed to bring their English up to a level where they are confident to deliver in English for more than 80% of class time. Four of 26 agreed to use as much English as possible whilst undertaking weekly language tasks to increase their proficiency, with 50% of all staff also deciding to sign on for extra weekly language tasks as part of their work plans.

Australian Short Term Advisors engaged by Austraining International, the TVETSSP Managing Contractor, to work with local staff in implementing AQTF competency based training have noted that over the year there has been a distinct improvement in their ability to grasp and explain core concepts from their industry areas, both orally and in the written form.

Evaluations from students have indicated very high satisfaction with the new competency based training that has been taking place at KIT, with overall satisfaction ratings at 97%. The primary reason for small levels of dissatisfaction was the lack of English spoken by some KIT trainers in class, which would indicate that students are ready to embrace the new policy. Staff and student attainment of competencies is also at over 90%; this indicates a commitment on behalf of the learners to their training and assessment plans, and from the trainers who are implementing high quality, student centred, needs and competency based training sessions.

Initial feedback from the November 2011 ISLPR benchmark testing indicates improvement compared to the March 2011 testing; at the time of publishing, full testing results were not available to enable comparative data analysis or comment.

Creating a Communicative language learning environment, inclusive of all staff and within a TVET Institute undergoing rapid TVET reform ensures that English remains important to the reform process and contributes to the achievement of the broader reform goals. The combination of a long term language consultant working with local counterparts to promote best practice facilitation methods,

²¹ Individualised Training Needs Analysis and Learning Plan

student centered learning, needs based curriculum design, implementation and integration creates sustainable and far reaching outcomes.

ARE THE INITIATIVES ADAPTABLE

The simple answer is Yes. The KIT TVETSSP approach can be applied to other countries (particularly Pacific small island states) undergoing TVET reform at a system and institutional level by:

- Mentoring local counterparts so they drive the development of an English Language Policy and a Communicative language learning environment.
- Mentoring local counterparts to design relevant student centered, contextually and culturally appropriate curriculum.
- Carefully selecting and applying English language testing systems to suit the needs of the learners at any one particular time during current and future educational development.
- Ensuring teachers acquire the necessary English proficiency to first develop their technical and teaching competence and then transfer the knowledge and skills to their students in an English speaking learning environment.
- Including sufficient resources in TVET reform programs to ensure the provision of a long term specialist English Language Adviser as well as technical advisers.
- Creating a communicative language learning environment, inclusive of all staff and students within a TVET institute.

References

(2009). *TVETSSP Project Design Document*. AusAID.

(2010). *The thinking behind English Unlimited*. Retrieved November 01, 2011, from Cambridge.org:
http://www.cambridge.org/servlet/file/EnglishUnlimited_LALL_PED_Methodology.pdf?ITEM_ENT_ID=5632970&COLLSPEC_ENT_ID=594

AMES, N. (2008). *Certificates I-IV in Spoken and Written English*. Surry Hills: NSW Adult Migrant English Service.

Feez, S., & Joyce, H. (2006). *Text-based Syllabus Design*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Harlow : Pearson Education Limited.

Ingram, D. E. (2003). *Towards More Authenticity in Language Testing*. Brisbane: AFMLTA National Conference.

Spratt, M., Pulverness, A., & Williams, M. (2011). *The Teaching Knowledge Test Course*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodward, T. (2001). *Planning Lessons and Courses*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wylie, E. (2007). *Differences between the ISLPR and IELTS*. Brisbane: ISLPR Language Services.