

An Evaluation of the English Language Curriculum in Language and Development Center at the University of Raparin

Researcher. Taghreed Wael Mohammed Ali

taghreed.431623002@uor.edu.krd

Asst. Prof. Dr. Hawraz Qader Hama

hawraz@uor.edu.krd

University of Raparin/Kurdistan Region/Iraq

تقييم منهج اللغة الانكليزية في مركز اللغة والتطوير في جامعة رابرين

الباحثة. تغريد وائل محمد علي

أ.م.د. هاوراز قادر حمه

كلية التربية/ جامعة رابرين / اقليم كردستان العراق

الملخص

أخذت اللغة الإنكليزية في العقود الأخيرة مكانتها المهمة بين لغات العالم، فهي لم تعد لغة تخاطب فحسب بل تعدت مجالات حضورها؛ لذا تعددت المناهج المعنية في تعليمها، والدراسات المقيمة لتلك المناهج، فجاءت هذه الدراسة بهدف تقييم المنهج المتبع في مركز اللغة والتطوير في جامعة رابرين - اقليم كردستان - العراق، فتم تقييم المنهج باتباع أسلوب (CIPP model) وعلى وفق محاور أربعة، هي: السياق، والمدخلات، والعمليات التعليمية، والمخرجات، وقد اعتمدت الدراسة بجمع البيانات المطلوبة على الوسائل الكمية والنوعية. تم جمع البيانات بواسطة الاستبيان العام بشمول (١٣٢) طالب و (٦) أساتذة يعملون في مركز اللغة والتطوير التابع لجامعة رابرين فضلا عن (١٢) متخرجًا مستفيدًا من الدورات السابقة، فضلا عن تقييم المواد التعليمية المستخدمة في مركز اللغة، وكذلك إجراء المقابلات اللازمة لذلك، وقد توصلت الدراسة إلى نتائج تتراوح بين الإيجابية والمتوسطة في محوري المدخلات وعمليات تنفيذ البرنامج، وإلى نتائج سلبية وفق محوري السياق والمخرجات.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تقييم، منهاج، سياق، مدخلات، عمليات، مخرجات، (CIPP)، مركز، اللغات، التطوير.

Abstract

In the past few decades, due to the importance of the English language, not only as a language of communication, but also as a medium of instruction, studies have shifted their attention to explore the effectiveness of English language curricula in teaching and learning the language. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of the English language curriculum used at the Language and Development Center at the University of Raparin/Kurdistan region\ Iraq. Following the CIPP model, and using the mixed-method research approach, data were collected from (132) learners, (6) instructors, and (12) alumni, through questionnaires, materials evaluation checklist, and the interviews. The results of the data analysis revealed

moderate to positive satisfaction in the input and the process phases, and poor satisfaction in the context and the product phases.

Keywords: Keywords: assessment, curriculum, context, inputs, processes, outputs, CIPP, center, languages, development.

Introduction

The English language plays a leading role in global communication, and is a principal medium for global business, learning, science, and technology. Its widespread use as a lingua franca has led most educational systems to incorporate ELT as a key aspect of their curricula, and numerous others have been encouraged to learn English for various purposes (Crystal, 2003; Richards, 2001).

However, in any educational setting, the curriculum evaluation plays an essential role that could guarantee the learners' abilities to handle all the necessary aspects in covering the needed skills in acquiring the English language. Null (2023) described the curriculum as the key factor for the growth of the educational process. Moreover, Brown (1989 cited in Tekir, 2020) mentioned, that the continuous nature of evaluation is an essential condition to guarantee cohesion among all the elements of language programme design. Furthermore, Brown described evaluation as a critical component that fixes each aspect of systematic curriculum evaluation for a more effective language programme. Similarly, Nunan (1988) emphasizes the necessity of including an evaluation component, arguing that any language program model would be incomplete without a continuous evaluation. Scarvian (1994) added, all of the concepts of evaluations are an attempt of searching of a better method than the former ones in looking for something more trustworthy. Most of these theories were subjected to firm restrictions according to the sensitivity of the topics they could cover like societal or cultural issues.

Language and Development Center (LDC) at the University of Raparin provides English language learning courses for those learners who wish to pursue the postgraduate studies because English proficiency is a requirement of this process. In addition, the LDC, uses an English language curriculum, which was developed by the university in corporation with an educational organization (Imperial English UK) based on digital English courses, and approved by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research in the Kurdistan region of Iraq.

Since there is an increasing demand of mastering English language in both academic and professional settings, expanding the need to evaluate the curriculum in any language training sector is necessary. However, an intensive evaluation for the application of the curriculum, has not been done yet. Moreover, studies on such evaluation process are rather limited.

Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to evaluate the curriculum used in language and development center (LDC) at Raparin University. Consequently, this study tries to shed the light on curriculum evaluation for The Language and

Development Center at the University of Raparin (LDC) by following the Stufflebeam model of evaluation (1960s) through answering the following research questions:

1. How well is the curriculum responsive to the needs and priorities of the educational context? (Context evaluation)
2. To what degree is the curriculum well-designed and planned based on sound educational principles? (Input evaluation)
3. To what extent is the curriculum implemented effectively? (Process evaluation)
4. How well does the curriculum improve the students' English language needed in their future careers? (Product evaluation)

Research Context and Sample

This study is conducted at the University of Raparin, located in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. More specifically, it collects data from sample participants at the Language and Development Center on the university's main campus. The sample of this study consists of postgraduate learners, alumni, and instructors from the Language and Development Center (LDC) at the University of Raparin during the 2024-2025 academic year. The study included 132 postgraduate learners (66 males and 66 females), and their age ranges from 29 to 39. The learners were from different academic fields; History, Arabic, Computer, Business Administration, Agriculture, Biology, Chemistry. The instructors who participated in this study were 6 ELT instructors who were delivering the courses offered by the LDC at the University of Raparin, their age range was between 26 and 39.

While the alumni who participated in this study consisted of 9 alumni, 6 males and 3 females. their age ranges from 26-48. They were from various fields of study such as Arabic, History, Computer, Biology, and Mathematics

Research Method

This study employed mixed-methods research approaches, namely, the quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. The first quantitative tool which is the questionnaires, distributed to both postgraduate learners and LDC instructors. The questionnaire includes two sections, the first section seeks to collect the participants' demographic information like age, gender, educational level, and field of the study. The other sections consist of 31 closed-ended items aligned with the CIPP model. Moreover, the reliability of the questionnaire was checked by employing the necessary statistical procedures in the SPSS software program, version (27). Consequently, the results revealed a high Cronbach's Alpha value of (0.96), which is considered as having a strong internal consistency and reliability, and ready for the final implementation and use.

The second quantitative tool which is the checklist, adapted from the previous related studies (e.g., **Jusuf**, 2018; **Kashoob**, 2018; **Tomlinson**, 2023), used to evaluate the materials adopted by the LDC at the University of Raparin. The checklist was also

statistically checked for its reliability through the use of specific features in the SPSS software program, version (27), and the results revealed that the Cronbach Alpha score is (0.93), which is considered to be reliable for collecting the related data. In addition, and to ensure the reliability of the checklist, the researcher and two other raters evaluated the LDC materials separately to avoid bias and to ensure confidentiality in the process of the data evaluation. The checklist consists of 37 items, divided into four sections aligned with the CIPP model on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from very poor to very good.

On the other hand, the qualitative data were gathered from the instructors and learners' interviews. Twelve questions aligned with the CIPP model were prepared for interviewing the instructors. The instructors interview questions were categorized into two sections: the first section contains background information, while the second section consists of nine questions aimed to obtain the instructors' opinions about the effectiveness of the curriculum. As for the learners and alumni interviews, eight questions were asked. the first part of the questions is related to the background information of the interviewees like age, gender, and current level of study. Moreover, the other questions include five open ended questions to get the learners' perceptions about the impact the curriculum had on the development of the learners' language skills by enrolling in the LDC courses. All of the questions are aligned with the components of the CIPP model.

Research Model

This study followed the CIPP model initiated by Daniel L. Stufflebeam (1960). The model is organized into four evaluation types, each addressing specific aspects in the curriculum, the context evaluation focuses on understanding the environment in which the curriculum is being implemented aiming to identify needs and priorities. While, the input evaluation assesses the resources, strategies, and planning involved in any program implementation. The process evaluation concerns with evaluating the actual implementation while the product involves judging the outcomes and impact that permit making decision suggesting contentions or modification. (Tunc, F., 2010). CIPP model is an effective tool that helps in determining the curriculum dimension. The evaluation can be progressed by creating set of inquiries revolve around each component of the CIPP model, context, input, process, and products This research will follow the CIPP model in investigating the curriculum effectiveness administrative by the LDC at the University of Raparin/Kurdistan region/Iraq.

Data Analysis Procedures

After collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, they were analyzed to obtain the answers to the research questions. Firstly, the questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics, which is a feature of the SPSS program, version (27). More

specifically, the analysis focused more on means, frequencies, percentages, and standard deviation.

Regarding the interviews, the learners' responses were transcribed and analyzed following thematic analysis, proposed by Braun and Clarke (2006). All the participants were assigned alphanumeric codes to maintain confidentiality and ensure anonymity. Instructors are coded as INS1, INS2, etc., learners as L1, L2, etc., alumni as A1, A2, etc. In addition, the interviews were analyzed by allocating themes and sub-themes to interpret the participants' responses deeply.

Furthermore, the analysis of the LDC materials guided by the checklist included a mean score for each item in the checklist. The means are employed to assess which item perceived less or higher evaluation than the other item. Consequently, the result will indicate more tangible understanding for the LDC materials.

Results

Results of the Quantitative Data Analysis

After analyzing the data using descriptive statistics, the following results were obtained.

Learners' Perception Analysis

"The Context Analysis"

This section consisted of five items exploring the learners' perceptions about the context of the curriculum. The analysis of the data produced the following results given in Table (1) below.

Table (1) learners and instructors questionnaire/Context evaluation

Items	SD & D %		N%		A&SA%		M		St.D.	
	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	LNS
1. The curriculum is appropriate for the improvement of the learners' language skills.	42.4	100	16	0	41.7	0	2.8	1.0	1.2	0
2. The reading, writing, listening and speaking skills well balanced in the curriculum.	38.7	100	19	0	42.4	0	2.9	1.1	1.2	0.40
3. The course materials of the curriculum are appropriate for the learners' level.	43.2	100	19.7	0	37.1	0	2.8	1.0	1.2	0
4. The course materials attract the learners' attention	42.4	16.7	26.5	16.7	31	66.7	2.7	3.6	1.1	1.03
5. The contents of the materials are comprehensible	40.1	16.7	18.2	66.7	41.6	16.7	2.8	3.0	1.2	0.63
Total average scores	41.3	66.6	19.8	16.6	38.7	16.6	2.8	1.9	1.1	0.4

Notes: L=Learner; INS=instructors; SD=Strongly Disagree; Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree; M=Mean; St.D.= Standard Deviation.

The table above illustrates the learners' and the instructors' general perceptions about the context evaluation. Concerning the learners, the total average scores showed that most of the learners have negative perceptions about the context of the curriculum (41.3% SD/D; M=2.8; St.D.=1.1). For example, in the first item more learners (42.4%) disagreed and strongly disagreed that the curriculum is appropriate improving the learners' language skills. This higher level of dissatisfaction suggests that the curriculum may not have been successful in improving the learners' language skills. In addition, in the third item more learners (43.2%) disagreed and strongly disagreed that the course materials are appropriate for the learners' level.

Similarity, according to the table above most instructors reflected their negative perception for the context evaluation, (66.6 % SD./D, M= 1.9; St.D.=0.4). For example, in the first statement, all the instructors (100%) strongly disagreed and disagreed indicating that all the instructors believed the curriculum is not sufficient in improving the learners' language skills.

Within a similar context, In the third item, all the instructors showed their dissatisfaction, (100. %) strongly disagreed and disagreed which raises the concern with whether the curriculum materials are appropriate for the learners' level. In response to the final statement, more instructors (66.7%) were neutral. Indicating a lack of positive consensus for the comprehensibility of the materials.

“The Input Analysis”

This section aims to analyze the learners' perceptions related to the “input analysis”. Six items were included to evaluate the learner's satisfaction of the input of the curriculum. the main findings are illustrated in the table (2) below.

Table (2) Learners and instructors questionnaire/ Input evaluation

Items	SD & D %		N%		A&SA%		M		St.D.	
	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	LNS
1. The audio-visual materials of the curriculum help the learners learn easily	33.4	33.4	27.3	16.7	39.4	50	2.9	3.0	1.1	1.2
2. The audio-visual materials of the curriculum attract the learners' attention	31.8	16.7	32.6	33.3	35.6	50	2.9	3.3	1.0	0.81
3. The audio-visual materials of the curriculum have positive effects on the learners' language skills	36.4	16.7	23.5	0	40.2	83.3	2.9	3.6	1.2	0.81
4. The classwork of the curriculum helps the learners learn easily	35.6	16.7	14.4	33.3	50	50	3.1	3.3	1.2	0.81

5. The classwork of the curriculum attracts the learners' attention	35.6	33.3	22.7	33.3	41.7	33.3	3.0	3.0	1.1	0.89
6. The classwork of the curriculum has positive effects on the learners' language skills	36.4	33.3	22.0	50	41.7	16.7	3	2.8	1.2	0.75
Total average scores	34.8	25.0	23.7	27.7	41.4	47.2	3	3.1	1.1	0.8

Notes: L=Learner; INS=instructors; SD=Strongly Disagree; Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree; M=Mean; St.D.= Standard Deviation.

The general examination for the total average scores reflects the learners' positive satisfaction concerning the curriculum input evaluation (41.4% SA/A; M=3; St.D.=1.1). In more details, the first statement demonstrates that more learners (33.4%) disagreed and strongly disagreed which indicates integrating the audio-visual materials helps the learners to learn easily. In the third item, more learners (40.2%) agreed and strongly agreed, the results indicate that the audio-visual materials have a moderate positive effect from the learner' perspective.

In the final statement, most responses tend to be positive, more learners (41.7%) agreed or strongly agreed, which suggests the classwork has a positive effect for improving the learning skills.

Within a similar context, the table above shows the instructors' positive perception about the input evaluation. (47.2 % SA./A, M= 3.1; St.D.= 0.8). The first three statements provide the instructors positive perception concerning the audio-visual materials. For example, in the first statement, more instructors (50%) agreed and strongly agreed that audio-visual materials increase the learning opportunity for the learners. Besides, in the third statement, more instructors (83.3%) agreed and strongly agreed suggesting the positive effect for the use of the audio- visual materials. Regarding the fourth statement, more instructors (50.0%) agreed and strongly that the classwork helps the learners learn easily.

“The Process Analysis”

The “process analysis”, which is the third part of the questionnaire employed to evaluate the implementation and adaptation of the curriculum. These details are illustrated in table (3) below

Table (3) Learners and instructors questionnaire/ process evaluation

Items	SD & D %		N%		A&SA%		M		St.D.	
	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	LNS
1. Sufficient exercises are done about each new topic in the curriculum	28.9	16.7	27.3	33.3	43.9	50	3.1	3.3	1.1	0.8
2. When necessary, revision is included in the curriculum	37.9	0	25.8	50	36.4	50	2.9	3.5	1.1	0.5

3. The consolidating homework is given to the learners about the newly learned topics	20.5	33.3	22.0	0	57.6	66.7	3.4	3.3	1.1	1.0
4. The curriculum enables the learners to participate in the course actively	34.9	33.4	25.8	0	39.3	66.7	2.9	3.3	1.1	1.5
5. The number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum is enough	30.3	0	22.0	50	47.8	50	3.1	3.8	1.2	0.9
6. The curriculum has activities suitable for pair and group work	24.3	16.7	28.0	33.3	47.8	50	3.1	3.3	1.1	0.8
7. The curriculum has activities in which all language skills can be applied	28.8	16.7	32.6	16.7	38.6	66.7	3.0	3.5	1.1	0.8
8. During the curriculum, the time spent on solving the learners' problems about English is enough.	47.0	50	22.0	33.3	31.0	16.7	2.7	2.3	1.2	1.2
Total average scores	31.5	20.8	25.6	27.0	42.8	50.0	3.0	3.2	1.1	0.9

Notes: L=Learner; INS=instructors; SD=Strongly Disagree; Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree; M=Mean; St.D.= Standard Deviation.

The ultimate average scores reveal the learners' positive satisfaction for the process evaluation (42.8% SA/A; M=3.0; St.D.=1.1). In first statement, more learners (43.9%) agreed and strongly agreed indicating a positive perception about the inclusion of sufficient materials for the newly topics.

In the fifth statement, more learners (47.8%) agreed and strongly agreed that the number of the formative tests applied during the curriculum was sufficient. However, in the last item, more learners (47.0%) disagreed and strongly disagreed that the time spent on solving the learners' problems about English was enough.

Regarding the instructors' analysis, the total average score shows the instructors' positive perception about the process evaluation. (50% SA./A, M=3.2; St.D.= 0.9).

In the third statemen, more instructors (66.7%) agreed and strongly agreed indicating that the instructors positively perceived that that the consolidating homework is given to the learners about each new learned topic. Similarity, in the fourth statement, more instructors (66.7%) agreed and strongly agreed the curriculum supports the active participation of the learners. In contrast, In the last statement, more instructors (50%) disagreed and strongly disagreed in reflecting their perception regarding the time spent on addressing the learners' problems suitability. In short, the instructors' perception reflects a weak level of satisfaction for the time provided to address the learners' problems.

“The Product Analysis”

In the “product analysis”, all of the included items aim to explore the learning outcome form the learners’ perspectives as shown in table (4) below.

Table (4) Learners and instructors questionnaire/ product evaluation

Items	SD & D %		N%		A&SA%		M		St.D.	
	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	INS	L	LNS
1. The curriculum meets the learners’ individual interests)	45.5	16.7	28.8	0	25.7	83.4	2.61	3.8	1.15	0.98
2. The curriculum meets the learners’ existing needs related with English	43.2	33.3	27.3	0	29.6	66.7	2.72	3.3	1.13	1.03
3. The curriculum forms a basis for the learners’ future needs related with English	44.7	66.7	25.8	16.7	29.5	16.7	2.72	2.5	1.16	0.83
4. The curriculum motivates the learners to learn English	42.4	16.7	21.2	50	36.4	33.3	2.82	3.1	1.25	0.75
5. The curriculum increases the learners’ vocabulary knowledge in English.	32.6	33.3	22.0	33.3	45.4	33.3	3.09	3.0	1.20	0.89
6. The learners’ improvement of English reading skills is satisfactory.	31.1	0	30.3	50	38.7	50	3.0	3.5	1.12	0.54
7. The learners’ improvement of English writing skills is satisfactory.	40.1	16.7	28.8	33.3	31.1	50	2.82	3.3	1.12	0.81
8. The learners’ improvement of English listening skills is satisfactory.	35.6	33.3	29.5	0	34.8	66.7	2.87	3.5	1.20	1.22
9. The learners’ improvement of English-speaking skills is satisfactory.	40.2	0	26.5	33.3	33.3	66.7	2.87	3.6	1.20	0.51
10. The learners’ improvement of English grammar is satisfactory	31.1	16.7	26.5	83.3	42.4	0	3.09	2.8	1.14	0.40
11. The English skills the learners acquire at the end of the curriculum are satisfactory.	43.2	16.7	26.5	33.3	30.3	50	2.68	3.3	1.26	0.81
12. The curriculum helps the learners to acquire the knowledge of English they need for their fields of study.	51.6	16.7	20.5	33.3	28	50	2.56	3.1	1.24	1.16
Total average scores	40.1	22.2	26.1	30.5	33.7	47.2	2.8	3.2	1.1	0.8

Notes: L=Learner; INS=instructors; SD=Strongly Disagree; Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree; M=Mean; St.D.= Standard Deviation.

The total average scores reveal the learners' negative perception about the product evaluation. (40.0 % SD./D, M= 2.8; St.D.=1.1). For example, In the first statement more learners (45.5%) disagreed and strongly disagreed indicating a negative insight related to the curriculum in meeting the learners' interests.

However, the overall perception regarding the learners' satisfaction for the language skills reflected through the eleventh statement, many learners (43.2%) disagreed and strongly disagreed which shows a limited satisfaction regarding the skills they acquired at the end of the curriculum. Concerning the last item, over half of the learners (51.6%) disagreed and strongly disagreed, the results suggest the curriculum did not match the learners' expectation concerning their academic needs.

In contrast, the total average highlights the instructors' positive perception about the process evaluation. (47.2% SA./A, M=3.2; St.D.= 0.8). In the first statement, more instructors (83.4%) agreed and strongly agreed that the curriculum meets the learners' individual interests.

Similarity, the same positive attitudes were observed in the ninth statement inquiring for the learners' improvement of English-speaking skills, many instructors (66.6%) agreed and strongly agreed indicating the curriculum improving the speaking skill for the learners.

Materials Evaluation Checklist

The teaching materials were evaluated based on the checklist. The evaluation conducted by the researcher with two teachers independently, all the materials were examined carefully under each category of the CIPP model, and the following results were achieved.

Table (5) Results of materials evaluation relating to the "context" category

No.	Evaluation category	Items	Mean (R1)	Mean (R2)	Mean (R3)	Average Mean
1.	Context	The materials are suitable to the teaching /learning context	4	4	4	4
2.		The course materials' contents correspond well with the teaching programme’s goals and the learner’s needs.	3	3	4	3.3
3.		The course materials develop advanced language skills like conversation, extended writing, and reading comprehension for intermediate and advanced learners.	3	4	3	3.3
4.		The materials are sufficient of genuine interest to learners.	3	3	4	3.3
5.		The required equipment like language lab, listening center, or video player, are available and reliable for use	3	4	2	3
average mean of the context evaluation			3.2	3.6	3.4	3.3

R1 = Rater 1 (researcher); R2 = Rater 2 (teacher1) R3 =(teacher2)

According to the total average mean score, the materials relating to the context category seem to be average as the mean score achieved is (3.3). For example, it was found that the materials are suitable for the teaching /learning context (M=4). Similarity, the course materials found to be “average” in developing advanced language skills like conversation, extended writing, and reading comprehension for intermediate and advanced learners (M=3.3).

Table (6) Results of materials evaluation relating to the “input” category

No.	Evaluation category	Items	Mean (R1)	Mean (R2)	Mean (R3)	Average Mean
1.	Input	The course materials offer sufficient variety and range of topics	4	4	4	4
2.		The course materials include supplementary materials.	5	5	3	4.3
3.		The contents are sequenced on the basis of complexity, learnability, usefulness, etc.	5	5	4	4.6
4.		The contents are organized according to structures, functions, topics, and skills	5	4	4	4.3
5.		The vocabulary material is sufficient in quality and quantity.	4	4	4	4
6.		The course materials include items for pronunciation.	3	2	4	3
7.		There are sufficient materials for integrated skill work.	4	4	4	4
8.		The reading skill is suitable for the students' level.	3	3	4	3.3
9.		The listening materials are authentic and well recorded.	3	3	1	2.3
10		The materials for spoken English are well designed to equip learners for real-life interactions.	3	3	3	3
11.		The writing activities provide appropriate guidance that prepare learners to create well-structured longer pieces.	3	2	3	2.6
12.		The topics are sophisticated enough in content but align with the learners' language level.	3	3	3	3
13.		The course materials provide adequate guidance for the instructors	2	4	3	3
14.		Answers keys to exercises are given.	4	4	4	4

15.		The materials are attractive.	4	4	1	3
16.		The materials are easy to obtain.	3	3	2	2.6
17.		The multimedia materials (audio, video, online platforms) are of high quality.	4	4	3	3.6
Average mean of the input evaluation			3.7	3.5	3.1	3.4

R1 = Rater 1 (researcher); R2 = Rater 2 (teacher1) R3 =(teacher2)

According to the total average mean score, the materials relating to the context category seem to be average as the mean score achieved is (3.4). For example, Furthermore, the results shown in Table 10 show that the course materials found to be “good” in including supplementary material (M= 4.3). Similarity, the contents found to be “good” on the basis of complexity, learnability, usefulness (M=4.6).

Table (7) Results of materials evaluation relating to the “process” category

No.	Evaluation category	Items	Mean (R1)	Mean (R2)	Mean (R3)	Average Mean
1.	Process	The materials effectively cover a variety of teaching techniques.	4	4	4	4
2.		The course materials are flexible that allow different teaching and learning applications.	4	4	3	3.6
3.		The layout of the course materials is clear.	4	4	3	3.6
4.		The materials promote active learner involvement.	4	4	5	4.3
5.		The techniques that are used for presenting/practicing new language items are suitable for the learners' level.	3	4	3	3.3
6.		The communicative abilities are developed during the teaching process.	4	4	3	3.6
7.		The learners are expected to take a degree of responsibility for their own learning.	5	5	4	4.6
8.		The materials provide opportunities for learners to achieve communicative competence	4	4	4	4
9.		The grading and the progression of the contents are suitable for the learners ' level.	4	4	4	4
Average mean of the process evaluation			4	4.1	3.6	3.8

R1 = Rater 1 (researcher); R2 = Rater 2 (teacher1) R3 =(teacher2)

According to the total average mean score, the materials relating to the process category appear to be average as the mean score achieved is (3.8).For example, In addition, the results shown in Table 11 demonstrate that the course materials founded to be “average” in its flexibility for allowing different teaching and learning

applications (M= 3.6). Similarity, the layout of the course materials found to be “average” in their clarity (M=3.6).

Table (8) Results of materials evaluation relating to the “product” category

No.	Evaluation category	Items	Mean (R1)	Mean (R2)	Mean (R3)	Average Mean
1.	Product	The materials include grammar reference sections.	4	5	4	4.3
2.		The course materials include standardized tests at the end of the course for performance evaluation	2	2	3	2.3
3.		The exams are suitable for reflecting the learners' actual performance	3	2	3	2.6
4.		The materials prepare the learners for the exam.	2	2	2	2
5.		The materials give learners a sense of achievement.	4	4	3	3.6
6.		The materials enhance learning in an interesting way	4	4	4	4
average mean of the product evaluation			3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1

R1 = Rater 1 (researcher); R2 = Rater 2 (teacher1) R3 =(teacher2)

Based on the total average mean score, the materials relating to the product category appear to be average as the mean score obtained is (3.1). While, the details revealed that the course materials were “poor” in including standardized tests at the end of the course for performance evaluation (M=2.3). However, the obtained results indicated that the materials were “average” in giving the learners a sense of achievement (M=3.6). While, the examination of the materials showed that the materials were “Good” in enhancing learning in an interesting way.

Data Analysis of the Semi-Structured Interviews

This section provides an analysis of the conducted interviews with the targeted population of this research, namely, instructors, learners, and the alumni who participated in the courses offered by the LDC at the University of Raparin. The codes and themes are assigned as the following:

Table (9) themes and sub themes of the interviews

Themes	Sub- theme 1	Sub-theme 2
Context	Community needs	Institutional challenge
Input	Appropriateness of course contents	Staff training
Process	Teaching delivery	Learners’ engagement
Product	Learning outcomes	Satisfaction and Impact

Instructors Thematic Analysis

Five semi- structured interviews were arranged with the instructors delivering the English curriculum at the University of Raparin. The aim of the instructors' interview was to find out more in depth their perception concerning the effectiveness of the curriculum used by the LDC at the University of Raparin.

1. Context Themes

A. Institutional Challenges

During the interviews, the instructors highlighted some institutional challenges that are essential in achieving the curriculum objectives , In particular, most instructors focused on a critical concept (time constrains), they referred to the mismatch between the allocated time required to cover the curriculum contents, INS1 highlighted this aspect by stating *"Our biggest problem is within the time constrain; we do not have enough time to deliver all the topics"* Similarity, the same thing was expressed by INS4 when he stated *"For the practical application we do not have enough time to cover all the topics of the curriculum"*

B. Community Needs

Regarding the community needs, the instructors reflected another point of view, particularly INS3 refer to the using of the digital application and how the learners struggle with the use of the online curriculum, also INS3 highlighted some aspects like the lack of the internet access that affects achieving the desired outcomes *"It's a good curriculum, but the students are not well prepared for it especially concerning their English background or their digital literacy and the weak internet connection"* INS2 clarified the need to have an internet access not only for the learners but even for the instructors *"I think the LDC should provide the internet access not only for the students but even for the teachers as well"* All the instructors' responses reflected the common challenges they encountered, in particular, the mismatch between the curriculum contents and time provided for it, in addition, they raised the concern for some technical problems that negatively impacted the curriculum learning objectives.

2. The Input Themes

Appropriateness of Contents

Multiple fluctuating perception were observed from the instructors responses, for example, INS1 stated *"On average, I think not all of the contents are relevant to the students fields"* While INS4 justified the irrelevance of the contents due to the different specialization of the participants *"Maybe because of the different levels of the participants not all of the course contents meet the students' needs"*. Similarity, INS3 added *"we are dealing with general English, not with specific English purposes, if we are dealing with English for specific purposes like nursing, we have to provide a specific curriculum"*

However, the main perspective noted by the instructors, is the gap between the intended general English of the curriculum and the divers needs of the learners from different academic fields.

3. The Process Themes

A. Teaching Delivery

A variety of teaching strategies are employed in the curriculum as highlighted by the instructors. In particular, many instructors highlighted positively the use of mixed method approaches that affiliated according to the teaching skill for instance INS2 emphasized that using mixed methods approaches are beneficial *“pair work, tasks, and group discussion are used within the course, all of the methods are beneficial”* INS5 added more details when stating *“I am using mixed methods approaches, the most important thing that the use of the method depends on the topic”*.

B. Learners Engagement

Concerning the learners' engagement, the instructor's responses referred to their efforts to engage the learners through participation and application for the recall learning strategies INS2 referred to this point by saying *“I always encourage the students to participate. In grammar for example, I encourage the students to tell me what they have learnt previously during the former lecture”* While INS5 added *“The teacher must be very creative in making the learners more motivated”*

C. Learner and Instructor Role

Many instructors revealed their positive satisfaction for applying the student-centered approach. Besides, they clarified the instructors primarily role is as a facilitator, INS2 reflected this view when stating *“The student-centered role is very effective in helping the students in achieving the course objectives like doing the tasks and participating”*. While INS3 described it by stating *“the teacher role is not to teach and make the student passive and just make them listen. So, the role of the teacher is as a facilitator and as a guide”*.

4. The Product Themes

A. Learning Outcomes

Many instructors described the curriculum as well designed that can enhance the improvement of the four skills, but the biggest challenge to achieve the desired outcome is the time limitation. For example, INS1 stated *“I think as a teacher the curriculum is quiet well design to improve the skills of the student. The same perception referred by INS3 when stating “the curriculum covers all the skills”*.

B. Satisfaction and Impact

The instructors shared their negative satisfaction, INS1 gave more description for the factors that negatively impacted the curriculum by stating *“I think the objectives of the curriculum are not being sufficiently achieved, these courses are within a limited framework. Our students just want to finish the course to get the certificate”*. INS4

shared the same view when stating *"I think the curriculum objectives are not fully achieved"*.

Thematic Analysis of the Alumni and the Learners

1.The Context Themes

A. Institutional Challenges

The interpretations of the alumni responses revealed an average satisfaction reflected by many alumni, for example A7 stated, *"I think the topics covered in the curriculum were appropriate to my English level"* Similarity A5 reflected the curriculum suitability for the learners needs by stating *"The curriculum was relevant with my academic need"*. While other learners indicated their dissatisfaction especially when A9 stating *"Generally speaking, I found the topics covered were somehow difficult"*.

B. Community Needs

Several alumni refereed that the curriculum did not address their needs related to the English language, for instance A4 declared *"According to my English background I did not learn anything new form the curriculum nor it covered my needs I just enrolled in this course to fulfil the requirement of ministry of education."* While A6 reflected this concept more deeply when stating *"Most of the students are not interested in learning the English language, they were obliged to attend the training course to finish their higher studies otherwise no one will participate in English language courses offered by the LDC"*.

On the other hand, the learners' indicated split opinions. Many learners showed that the curriculum was not appropriate to their level or needs, L2 illustrated this point by stating *"I was at the beginner's level; the topics was so difficult for my level and even the tasks were highly difficult for me. In general, it was not appropriate neither for my level nor for my needs"*. While L3 highlighted another point of view through stating the level was too challenging especially for the learners from non-English academic background *"As a postgraduate student in the humanities, I think these levels were difficult for us unlike the others from scientific studies like medicine"*

Additionally, other learners described the curriculum and the topics were relevant and appropriate, for example, L4 added *"The topics covered were quite appropriate, because of my English background I did not face any problem in the curriculum. I think that it covers my needs and even appropriate to the student of elementary level."* Within a similar context, the same positive satisfaction was revealed by L6 when stating *"I am good in English language and thus I found the level appropriate to my level and needs"*.

3. The Input Theme Appropriateness of Contents

The majority of the learners and alumni were influenced by of the speaking skill, in particular the activities that integrated speaking like group discussion, A1 stated the impact of the speaking skill when stating *"The speaking was the most useful part during the course."*, within a similar context, L12 thought that participating in groups made the learners more motivated *"We were more motivated to speak through our participation with the leaners. It was useful not only to improve the speaking skill but it is a good opportunity by which we exchanging new words"*.

In addition, L5 founded that not only listening skill was useful but also the reading skill was improved through his participation in the LDC courses when stating *"I think that my skills was improved concerning listening and reading, many activities and assignments were included in the curriculum that helped me to progress in these two skills"*.

3. The Process Themes Learners' Engagement

Many alumni shad the light on the time limitation that affected the learning process. For example, A6 stated that the curriculum contains too much materials *"The given topics were too much for us, we cannot control it. The curriculum was overloaded in comparison with the provided time so I think it's better to reduce the items of the materials"*. While A1 gave more description through stating *"Due to the time limitation the instructor was obliged to skip some of the topics"*. In addition, some factors like the weak internet access, the difficulty of using the online application and the technological problems mentioned by many alumni. More specifically, A4 refereed to the difficultly of learning by the online platform when stating *"learning by the online platform was very difficult. Another issue, the need for the internet access even some instructors tell us to share the internet with them"*.

The learners' interpretation revelated similar responses with the alumni. Many learners reflected the density of the assignments and the tasks as stated by L1 *"During the course we faced a problem with the daily task given to us. It was too long and the time given to complete it was inappropriate"*. While, other learners identified some technical problems like the weak internet access or the difficulty of using the online curriculum. L8 highlighted this issue by stating *"Many technological problems we faced during the implementation of the activities especially the weak internet connection, this kind of learning is total based on digital online learning, if we cannot access the internet, we cannot finish our tasks"*.

The Product Themes

A. Learning Outcomes

The alumni shared similar opinions; they indicated the final test included materials that were not covered during the course. This gap affects the learners' performance, they were evaluated on unfamiliar contents. A1 added a detailed explanation for his concept regarding the tests by stating *"The test was completely quite different of what we have studied during the test"*. In addition, some alumni provided more illustration A4 stated *"online testing was considered new to us and challenging"*.

The learners' interpretations revealed the same negative perception for the final test for example L1 described this point by stating *"the test was difficult, we do not have an enough time to answer all the questions"*, In contrast, other learners indicated the final test was fair and affiliated with the curriculum, L6 stated: *"I found all the assessments suitable whether the daily assessment or the final test. I did not face any problem"*

B. Satisfaction and Impact

Most alumni and learners significantly pointed that that the curriculum was not useful for their academic field or career for instance A2 stated *"In fact, learning English is something good but as a teacher in a humanitarian field I did not find it useful for my academic study or my field."*, while A7 provided more in depth explanation for the curriculum impact when stating *"This kind of curriculum is a general English, it's not for specific purposes, all of the topics were how to deal with someone in English"*. Similarity, the learners reflected the same perception especially when stating *"none of the topics were relevant to my specialist so it did not impact my academic field"*. While L6 explained the real reason for enrollments was just to get the certificate by stating *"The enrollment for the LDC courses was to fulfill the requirements of ministry of higher education, I can say that this course did not impact my academic field"*.

Discussion

Context evaluation assesses needs and problems within a defined environment (Stufflebeam, 2007). The data tools employed in the context stage aimed to answer the first research question: "How well does the curriculum respond to the needs and priorities of the educational context?" The examination of the questionnaire's findings revealed that neither the learners nor the instructors were delighted that the curriculum met the learners' needs. For instance, the finding of item (3) inquiring about the course materials' appropriateness for the learners' level, many learners showed a negative perception. From the instructors' side, all the instructors reflected their low level of agreement.

Regarding the second quantitative tool, the examination of the checklist used to evaluate the LDC materials at the University of Raparin showed an average level of satisfaction in the context evaluation. In the interviews. The instructors expressed

dissatisfaction, particularly regarding the mismatch between the curriculum content and the allocated time. Although some learners found the curriculum somewhat appropriate to their levels, many others indicated that it was not successful in covering their needs. Especially when they spotted the light due to the lack of digital access. The data obtained from the quantitative and qualitative tools for context evaluation indicated that not all the requirements and learners' needs were adequately diagnosed. In a study conducted by Ulu (2016), which employed both quantitative and qualitative methods to evaluate a state high school's EFL program in Turkey, similar findings were observed. The researcher indicated that the course materials did not effectively cover the learners' needs.

Regarding the input evaluation, the data collection tools were provided to answer the second research question related to the input evaluation: "To what degree is the curriculum well-designed and planned based on sound educational principles?". The questionnaire results indicated moderate satisfaction among the learners and instructors. For example, many learners and instructors in the first and second items reflected a satisfactory level of agreement that the audio-visual materials enhanced the learners' improvement. In a study based on a CIPP evaluation conducted by Alokazay et al. (2023) to assess the curriculum used at Paktia University, similar findings were observed in the input evaluation. For example, in the item referring to the use of audio-visual materials, the same perception was observed among both learners and instructors. The same moderate satisfaction was indicated through the analysis of the LDC materials guided by the checklist. In analyzing the interviews for input, a moderate level of satisfaction was perceived by the instructors in their responses to the question about the balance of content related to the students' needs. However, some instructors highlighted the inappropriateness of the materials to the learners' fields of study. However, the majority of them expressed satisfaction with their speaking skills because the group work enhanced their learning experience.

Concerning the process evaluation, the data obtained from both quantitative and qualitative sources served to investigate the third research question in this study: "To what extent is the curriculum implemented effectively?" The results of the learners' interpretations, as reflected in the questionnaires, showed moderate satisfaction with the process evaluation. However, the learners in item (8) indicated that the time spent addressing their problems is not adequate. The same finding was observed in a study conducted by researchers who evaluated the curriculum at Yeldiz Technical University, where they indicated that the time allocated for learners to solve the learning challenges they encountered while learning English was not sufficient (Karatas, 2009).

The checklist revealed more positive satisfaction with the process evaluation. In addition, the evaluation obtained from the interviews reflected that most instructors agreed that the curriculum supports a learner-centered approach and the primary role

of instructors as facilitators. They considered it an effective means that enhances the learners' engagement. These findings are similar to a study based on outcomes-based education (OBE) conducted by Harahap et al. (2024), which follows the CIPP model. The product evaluation aimed to answer the fourth research question in this study: "How well does the curriculum improve the students' English language skills needed in their future careers?" The questionnaire analysis reflected negative responses from the learners but more positive responses from the instructors. The semi-structured interviews revealed that many learners reflected that the enrollment in LDC courses did not impact their academic needs; similarly. Similarly, many instructors expressed dissatisfaction that the curriculum's objectives were not fully achieved. While the checklist revealed that the materials were average, it also showed that they were inadequate in preparing the learners for the exams. These findings were similar to those of a study conducted by Chen (2009), in which most learners agreed that the training course did not impact their field of study.

Study Limitations

The main limitation of this study is that it is based on the evaluation of a newly adopted curriculum. The instructors' insights may differ as they become more experienced and familiar with the curriculum's contents.

Another limitation faced by the researcher is the time constraint; in other words, the researcher is restricted to a limited time frame for conducting the research. At the same time, the courses offered by the LDC are not available throughout the entire academic year.

Conclusions

This study aims to evaluate the curriculum used at the Language and Development Center at the University of Raparin/Kurdistan Region/Iraq. The evaluation was conducted through the four phases of the CIPP model. The data obtained from both qualitative and quantitative sources revealed significant findings. Regarding the context evaluation, less satisfaction was observed, as reflected in the questionnaire analysis for both learners and instructors. Similarly, the checklist revealed that the materials were average in aligning with the learners' needs and goals. The interview, however, showed that the instructors, learners, and alumni did not find the curriculum to be aligned with the learners' needs.

In the input phase, more positive results were found. The questionnaire analysis revealed that both instructors and learners expressed positive satisfaction with the sources and contents. The checklist indicated that the LDC materials were average, while the interviews revealed moderate satisfaction with the appropriateness of the contents among stakeholders. In the process evaluation phase, the questionnaire analysis revealed that both instructors and learners were satisfied with the teaching practices. The checklist indicated that the materials were suitable for curriculum application. While the interpretation of the interviews showed that the instructors were

more satisfied than the learners and alumni in rating the process of curriculum implementation, especially in terms of teaching styles and speaking skills. Finally, in the product evaluation phase, the questionnaire showed that instructors were generally satisfied, while learners expressed less satisfaction. At the same time, the checklist demonstrated that the materials were average. In addition, the interview revealed that the instructors, learners, and alumni had limited learning outcomes. The researcher suggested that further studies should be conducted to gain a broader understanding of curriculum effectiveness, not only at LDC at Raparin University but also in other LDCs within the Kurdistan region. In addition, the researchers suggested that more time should be provided to cover all the materials included in the curriculum sufficiently.

References

- Alokozay, W., Zahid, S., & Noori, N. A. (2023). Lecturers and Students' Attitudes towards English Language Department Curriculum of Languages and Literature Faculty Paktia-University by Using CIPP Model. *Context*, 88(3.29), 83.
- Beauchamp, G. A. (1975). *Curriculum theory*. (3rd ed). Kagg Press.
- Bhuttah, T. M., Xiaoduan, C., Ullah, H., & Javed, S. (2019). Analysis of curriculum development stages from the perspective of Tyler, Taba and Wheeler. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 58(1), 14-22.
- Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. Cambridge university press.
- Jusuf, H. (2018). The models of checklist method in evaluating ELT textbooks. *Al-Lisan: Jurnal Bahasa (e-Journal)*, 3(2), 17-35.
- Karatas, H., & Fer, S. (2009). Evaluation of English curriculum at Yildiz Technical University using CIPP model. *Egitim ve Bilim*, 34(153), 47.
- Kashoob, M. (2018). *Evaluating ELT Materials with Specific Reference to Colleges of Applied Sciences General Foundation Programme in Oman: Towards a Viable checklist* (Doctoral dissertation, University of York).
- Null, W. (2023). *Curriculum: From theory to practice*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Second Language Proficiency Assessment and Program Evaluation*.
- Ornstein, A. C., & Hunkins, F. P. (2013). *Curriculum: Foundations, principles and issues*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Richards, J.C., 2001. *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge university press.
- Scriven, M. (1994). Evaluation as a discipline. *Studies in educational Evaluation*, 20(1), 147-166.
- Sibarani, G. G. T., Choms, A., Ahsan, J., & Umar, A. T. (2025). *Evaluation of the implementation of the OBE curriculum with the CIPP model (context, input, process, and product) at the Faculty of Economics, State University of Medan*.

- Stufflebeam, D. L. (2007). CIPP evaluation model checklist.
- Stufflebeam, D. L., McKee, H., & McKee, B. (2003, March). The CIPP model for evaluation: An update, a review of the model's development, a checklist to guide implementation. In *Annual Conference of the Oregon Program Evaluators Network (OPEN), Portland, Oregon* (Vol. 10). Tunc, F., 2010. *Evaluation of an English language teaching program at a public university using CIPP model* (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University).
- Tekir, S. (2020, January). Evaluation of english as a foreign language program in Turkey. In *ACADEMIC STUDIES* (p. 183).
- Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2023). *Developing materials for language teaching*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Ulum, Ö. G. (2016). Evaluation of English as a foreign Language program-using CIPP (context, input, process and product) model. *European Journal of English Language Teaching*.