

Curriculum Standards Development of the Implemented CBI Model in the Context of UIN Suska Riau

Kalayo Hasibuan

Pusat Pengembangan Bahasa,
UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau,
Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Content-based Instruction (CBI) has three most commonly known models. This article presents a Theme-based as one of the CBI models that has been implemented in integrating content and language for teaching students in higher education. The implemented model needs to be developed to keep up with new challenges and to be aligned with the curriculum standards and the students' needs. Therefore, curriculum standards development is described to show the matrix of curriculum targets from personal or general-related goals to academic or work-related goals. Then, as the consequence of the curriculum standards development, a high possibility to implement two other types of CBI, namely the Sheltered Model and the Adjunct Model is also described.

KEYWORDS: Content-Based Instruction, integration, theme-based, content and language

1 INTRODUCTION

Islamic State University of Sultan Syarif Kasim (UIN Suska) Riau is one of the universities in Indonesia that has proclaimed to be a World-Class University (Statute of UIN Suska Riau, 2014-2023). One of the challenges for a higher education institution to be internationally recognized is the mastery of English language as the international communication by its community. Higher education institutions especially those do not belong to English speaking countries like Indonesian tertiary institutions must find out an approach how its stakeholders such as lecturers, and students collaboratively acquire English language. The approach offered is by implementing the Content-Based Instruction (CBI) curriculum for specific courses. However, the main motivation in EFL contexts for adopting a CBI based curriculum is in order to provide students with comprehensive input through content so that they can develop their English proficiency.

According to Howard (2006), the mission to be a World Class University requires a curriculum in which the development of foreign language competency is one of the key elements. Howard mentioned the other four important issues. First, language programs are entrusted, in collaboration with faculty from other academic programs, with the undertaking of coordinating content-based language instruction throughout the

Institute. Second, Institute's commitment to international education enables students, faculty, and staff to have a clear picture of what our goals are and what we should do to reach these goals. Third, the development of foreign language and cross-cultural skills are of vital importance for cultivating students' global competence. Forth, the language faculty concurs that the primary goal for language education is to develop students' language competence and cultural understanding. We see content-based instruction as a valuable and effective method.

In conclusion, based on Howard's research findings, there are four main points in developing foreign language instruction: (1) foreign languages are across the Institute's curriculum, (2) the academic subject is defined, (3) students have clear professional goals, and (4) the administration is committed to international education. Through the findings, the faculty members believe that CBI exposes students to relevant and meaningful language use, integrates their language and content studies, and empowers them to become autonomous learners who are able to continue learning beyond the classroom. Such a belief has resulted in a content focused language curriculum.

Language Development Center of UIN Suska Riau as a unit that supports the university's vision to be a World-Class University is in the process of designing and implementing the content focused language curriculum. The language center provides languages courses (in English and Arabic) for students of the university who are not majoring in English or Arabic. Therefore, contents (course materials) related to different majors in the university are designed to meet the language standards of the language center. For that reason, a model of teaching that is intended to help the students learn the contents and develop the language skills at the same time needs to be developed. This article presents the curriculum standards development of the implemented model of integrating content and language for teaching EFL students in the context of UIN Suska Riau. The model is also intended to be developed for Indonesian and Arabic courses which are also provided at the Language Development Center.

2 CONTENT BASED INSTRUCTION (CBI) IN EFL CONTEXTS

Quoting Butler (2005, p. 234), teaching through CBI appears to be a widespread assumption that providing meaningful input through content is a sufficient base for adequate language development. Its primary goal in EFL contexts is on language learning and requires conscious efforts to design and employ appropriate curricula, tasks, instructional strategies, and assessment are necessary in order to facilitate students' language learning.

Genesee (1994, p. 3) claims that content includes not only as academic issues, but any topic, theme or non-language issue of interest or importance to the learners. Whereas, Met (1999, p. 150) has suggests that content in content-based programs represents material that is cognitively engaging and demanding for the learner, and is material that extends beyond the target language or target culture. Content, according to Brinton, Snow and Wesche (1989); Curtain and Pesola (1994); and Met (1991), provides rich avenues for meaningful and purposeful language use. In addition, Stoller (2004) and Wesche and Skehan (2002) maintain that based on a number of case studies support the idea that content-based instruction (CBI) is beneficial. Furthermore, Heo (2006, p. 30) emphasizes that the most important point about CBI is that CBI is proved to reflect learners' needs in terms of preparation for academic courses and helps the learners access the content of academic learning. However, Heo (2006), Pally (1999),

and Wesche and Skehan (2002) argue that even though Stoller (2004) states that CBI is effective to bridge the gap between English as a second language (ESL) classes and regular academic work in English, in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, where no native speaker models are available, and little cultural input occurs outside class, CBI is seen to be less effective.

In addition, Bragger & Rice (1999), as cited in Stoller (2004, p. 266), suggest that it must be recognized that there can be a "sudden jump" in difficulty when foreign language students move from language instruction to literature classes or other academic topics taught in a foreign language. Consequently, it should not be assumed that transferring the design of a CBI course that is effective in an ESL setting to an EFL setting will result in a course that is equally effective. Therefore, there must be graded models of English language programs designed in order that a CBI course can effectively be implemented in in EFL settings.

The most commonly known models according to Briton, Snow, and Wesche (1989) are the three prototypes. The first is defined by Theme-based, the language class is structured around topics or themes, with the topics forming the backbone of the course curriculum. The second prototype is Sheltered where content courses taught in the target language by a content specialist. Target language learners are sheltered from native-speaking students of the language. The last is Adjunct in which students are enrolled concurrently in two linked courses, a language course and a content course. Learners are sheltered in the language course, but integrated in the content course. Shaw (1997) labels these additional models as follows:

1. Direct content model (similar to Met's total immersion) - the subject matter is delivered entirely in the target language. All readings, all classroom discussions, and all assignments are in the target language. For instance, a political science professor gives the course "The Internationalization of Japan" completely in Japanese. The direct content model includes some native Japanese speakers in the class. Foreign language learners are not sheltered.
2. Team content model - the course is taught by two instructors, one from the subject matter field and one a specialist in language instruction. They work in a team-teaching format, which maximizes learning opportunities by utilizing the combined knowledge and talents of the teaching team. All readings, texts, classroom interactions, and assignments are in the target language.
3. Subsidiary content model - a content specialist delivers the subject matter in English. After the new topic is introduced and its scope examined, the topic is studied with greater specificity in the second language.

A well-recognized implementation of CBI in EFL settings is through theme based courses. Duenas, (2004, p. 4) states that theme-based courses are the most commonly applied model in CBI, in which theme-based courses have explicit language aims that are usually more important than the content learning objectives. Theme-based courses, according to Duenas, would constitute the weakest representation of CBI models. Kavaliauskiene (2004) conducted a research in Lithuania to show that the integration of content-based instruction into the ESP classroom results in a positive difference in promoting learner autonomy as well as progress in vocabulary, writing, making presentations, and project work. Kavaliauskiene cites Rivers (1992, p. 41) concludes that the research conducted supports four major empirical research findings emphasizing the benefits of CBI. First, thematically organized materials are easier to learn and remember; Second, coherent and meaningful information is deeper and better

processed; Third, the common outcome of CBI is a link between learner motivation and interest; Fourth, it develops expertise in a topic through a sequence of complex tasks.

When the goals of theme-based courses are completed, the English courses are designed into Sheltered Model that is another CBI model combining content and language into one course, which would make the course more close to sheltered subject-matter instruction. Duenas (2004) notes that the overall purpose of sheltered courses is the focus on learning is more on content rather than language learning; so this model constitutes one of the “strong” paradigms within the general framework of CBI. Sheltered models are more often used with advanced students, who are to participate in instructional processes using the target language (L2).

Based on Chapple (1998) researched the readiness of students in Hong Kong through a sheltered course on film, with English as the medium of instruction notes that students’ responses on an end-of-course evaluation were quite positive with regard to content knowledge and language proficiency achievement, as well as the sheer enjoyment of the course, which is in line with previous findings on CBI in that it leads to successful subject matter learning.

3 THE CURRICULUM STANDARDS OF THE IMPLEMENTED CBI MODEL IN UIN SUSKA RIAU

In the Language Development Center of UIN Suska Riau, CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference) becomes the framework of the language standards that are designed to be aligned with the course content in CBI model for Foreign Arabic, English, and Indonesian for non-native courses. The followings are the implemented language standards in the English courses which refer to the CEFR levels and to be developed for Indonesian and Arabic courses the Language Development Center.

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
I (Breakthrough)	CEFR A1 (Basic user)	<p>1. Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type.</p> <p><i>Mampu memahami dan menggunakan ungkapan-ungkapan sehari-hari yang familiar dan frasa-frasa dasar yang bertujuan untuk mengungkapkan kebutuhan-kebutuhan yang konkrit.</i></p> <p>القدرة على فهم و استخدام التعبيرات اليومية الشائعة والعبارات البسيطة لهدف إلى الحاجات المعينة.</p> <p>2. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has.</p> <p><i>Mampu memperkenalkan diri sendiri dan orang lain dan mampu bertanya jawab tentang informasi pribadi seperti tempat tinggalnya, orang-orang yang dikenalnya dan benda-benda yang dimilikinya.</i></p> <p>القدرة على تعرّف النفس وغيره ومسؤول على المعلومات النفسية مثل</p>

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
		<p>السكن والإنسان الذي عرفه والأشياء التي ملكه.</p> <p>3. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</p> <p><i>Mampu berinteraksi secara sederhana dengan orang lain yang berbicara dengan perlahan dan jelas dan yang siap untuk membantu.</i></p> <p>القدرة على المعاملة البسيطة مع غيره الذي تكلم مهلا وواضحا ومستعدا لمساعدته.</p>
II (Waystage)	CEFR A2 (Basic user)	<p>4. Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment).</p> <p><i>Mampu memahami kalimat-kalimat dan ungkapan-ungkapan yang sering digunakan berkaitan dengan topik-topik yang paling relevan (seperti informasi dasar tentang pribadi dan keluarga, berbelanja, daerah setempat, pekerjaan).</i></p> <p>القدرة على فهم الجمل والتعبيرات المستخدمة التي تتعلق بالموضوعات المناسبة (مثل المعلومات البسيطة عن الشخصية وأهله، والسوق، والمحلية، المهنة)</p> <p>5. Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters.</p> <p><i>Mampu mengkomunikasikan tugas-tugas sederhana dan rutin yang memerlukan pertukaran informasi yang sederhana dan langsung tentang hal-hal yang dikenali (familiar) dan rutin.</i></p> <p>القدرة على اتصال الواظفة البسيطة التي تحتاج على تبادل المعلومات البسيطة والمباشرة عن الأشياء الشائعة.</p> <p>6. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</p> <p><i>Mampu menjelaskan secara sederhana tentang aspek-aspek latarbelakangnya, lingkungan terdekat dan hal-hal tentang kebutuhan yang mendesak.</i></p> <p>القدرة على الشرح البسيط عن النواح، والخلفية النفسية، والبيئة، والأشياء المحتاجة.</p>
III (Threshold)	CEFR B1 (Independent user)	<p>7. Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc.</p> <p><i>Mampu memahami inti-inti dari masukan (bahasa) yang jelas dan standar tentang hal-hal yang biasa</i></p>

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
		<p><i>ditemui dalam pekerjaan, sekolah, rekreasi, dll.</i></p> <p>القدرة على فهم الفكرة الرئيسية واضحا عن الأشياء التي تتعلق بالمهنة، والمدارس، والتمشي، وغيرها.</p> <p>8. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken.</p> <p><i>Mampu menangani sebagian besar situasi yang akan dihadapi ketika berjalan-jalan di daerah di mana bahasa (Inggris/Arab) digunakan.</i></p> <p>القدرة على حل المشكلة التي سيواجهها حينما يسافر إلى الأماكن التي تستخدم اللغة العربية والإنجليزية.</p>

To achieve the curriculum targets, the Language Development Center has implemented the Theme-based model as defined by Briton, Snow, and Wesche (1989). It is because the sheltered and adjunct models are not appropriate as theme-based model in achieving the curriculum targets in the context of UIN Suska Riau. Furthermore, the curriculum targets for the three level courses are more focused to help students to learn English for personal or general-related goals than academic or work-related goals. The brief description of the implemented courses is as follows:

3.1 COURSE TITLE: ENGLISH LEVEL 1

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

English 1 begins to take students from the Starter to A1 English level on the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference). It starts by reinforcing statements and expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance such as his/her surrounding environment, background, and simple routines, completing tasks requiring simple and direct information exchange, and describing matters in areas of immediate need. It continues by understanding the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, science and technology. The course finishes by reducing simple connected text on topics that are familiar or of personal interest, describing experiences, places, and events; and giving advice, reasons and explanations for options and plans.

OBJECTIVES TIED TO STANDARDS

Objective	Standard
1. To work towards A1 language proficiency.	1.c. Language Proficiency

SUGGESTED TEXTS:

Hasibuan, K. (2015). *REACH Level 1*. Pekanbaru: Kreasi Edukasi.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

1. The minimum passing score is 60 or C.	1.c. Language Proficiency
--	---------------------------

Course Calendar

Week(s)	Topic / Activity Language Objective	Standard	Task
1-2	Meeting People <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be (am/is/are) ▪ Pronouns ▪ Wh-word (how) ▪ Nouns and Verbs 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
3-4	Families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wh-word (who) ▪ Plural nouns this, that, these, those ▪ Have/has ▪ Possessive adjectives 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
5-6	Occupations and Job Responsibilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present simple ▪ Yes/No questions ▪ 5Ws and an H questions 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
7-8	Are you feeling well? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present simple Vs. Present continuous ▪ Modals (should, can, could, may) ▪ Present perfect Vs. Past simple 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
9-10	Routines and Leisure Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like / love + ing ▪ Adverbs of frequency ▪ Expressions of frequency ▪ Prepositions of time (on, at, in) ▪ Past simple (Regular and irregular verbs) 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
11-12	Shopping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Countable and Uncountable nouns ▪ A/an, some and any ▪ A lot of and not much / not many ▪ How many / how much ▪ Prepositions of place ▪ Adjectives 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
13-14	My Campus life <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Present simple: verbal and nominal sentences 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Reading Speaking

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Must/Mustn't ▪ Passive voice ▪ Adjectives 		Writing How are these used?
15	Written Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Reading Writing How are these assessed?
16	Spoken Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A1 level	Listening Speaking How are these assessed?

STANDARDS addressed in this course

Standard 1.c. Language proficiency.

The Language Development Center of UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau has adopted the Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR), as reference to specify the minimum level of proficiency students who are not majoring in English should have to perform successfully. Being this, the A1 level.

3.2 COURSE TITLE: ENGLISH LEVEL 2

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

English 2 takes the students from the A1 to A2 English level on the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference). It is the next course of language and skills development that helps the students to communicate naturally and effectively. It continues to develop communicative skills including describing people's personalities, dreams and characters, habits, and routines. Other communicative acts include opinions, agreements, disagreements, feelings, and beliefs. It also enables the candidate to respond to personal letters and notes. It finishes by talking about and recognizing written material encountered in letters, brochures and in straightforward newspaper articles.

OBJECTIVES TIED TO STANDARDS

Objective	Standard
2. To work towards A2 language proficiency.	1.c. Language Proficiency

SUGGESTED TEXTS:

Hasibuan, K. (2015). *REACH Level 2*. Pekanbaru: Titian Cahaya Pusaka Abadi.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

2. The minimum passing score is 60 or C.	1.c. Language Proficiency
--	---------------------------

Course Calendar

Week(s)	Topic / Activity Language Objective	Standard	Task
1-2	Self-Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like (v, adv, prep, and adj) ▪ Pronouns ▪ Wh-word (how) ▪ Nouns and Verbs 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
3-4	Preferences <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wh-word (who) ▪ Like and dislike ▪ Gerund ▪ I'd prefer + to + verb/I'd rather + verb 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
5-6	Religion and Its practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes/No questions ▪ 5Ws and an H questions ▪ Present simple 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
7-8	City life <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There + be ▪ Parts of speech (verb, adjective, noun, & adverb) ▪ Adjective clauses 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
9-10	Welfare <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verbs (tenses) ▪ Be going to ▪ Modals (can, may, & must) ▪ Passive, imperative, & conditional ▪ Direct and indirect 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
11-12	Preserving cultures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adverb clauses: time expressions ▪ 5Ws and an H questions 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
13-14	Preserving environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefixes and suffixes ▪ Parts of speech 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
15	Written Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency.	Reading Writing

		Being this, the A2 level	How are these assessed?
16	Spoken Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the A2 level	Listening Speaking How are these assessed?

STANDARDS addressed in this course

Standard 1.c. Language proficiency.

The Language Development Center of UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau has adopted the Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR), as reference to specify the minimum level of proficiency students who are not majoring in English should have to perform successfully. Being this, the A2 level.

3.3 COURSE TITLE: ENGLISH LEVEL 3

BRIEF DESCRIPTION:

English 3 takes the students from the A2 to B1 English level on the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference). It is the next course of language and skills development that helps the students to communicate naturally and effectively. The course reinforces and deepens grammar structures studied in previous levels. It also presents new vocabulary in different areas as verbs, synonyms, opposites, collocations, word families. As far as the receptive skills, the course offers a variety of opportunities for students to continue developing their reading and listening by using new learning strategies. Regarding the productive skills, it uses group discussions, short presentations, debates, and other techniques to continue developing oral production and interaction; the course presents new writing activities that help students master a good range of topics and formats.

OBJECTIVES TIED TO STANDARDS

Objective	Standard
3. To work towards B1 language proficiency.	1.c. Language Proficiency

SUGGESTED TEXTS:

Hasibuan, K. (2015). *REACH Level 3*. Pekanbaru: Titian Cahaya Pusaka Abadi.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

3. The minimum passing score is 60 or C.	1.c. Language Proficiency
--	---------------------------

Course Calendar

Week(s)	Topic / Activity Language Objective	Standard	Task
1-2	The Media <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comparative sentences ▪ Superlative sentences 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
3-4	Business and Money <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collocations ▪ Gerund ▪ Participles 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
5-6	Discoveries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simple past ▪ Present perfect tense 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
7-8	Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conditional sentences 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
9-10	Job and Professions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verbs with preposition ▪ Present perfect tense 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
11-12	The Globalization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clauses and sentences 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
13-14	Islam and Science <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active and passive sentences ▪ Subject verb agreement ▪ Correlative conjunction ▪ Affixes 	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Listening Reading Speaking Writing How are these used?
15	Written Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Reading Writing How are these assessed?
16	Spoken Final Exam	Standard 1.c. Language	Listening

		proficiency. Being this, the B1 level	Speaking How are these assessed?
--	--	--	--

STANDARDS addressed in this course

Standard 1.c. Language proficiency.

The Language Development Center of UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau has adopted the Common European Framework for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (CEFR), as reference to specify the minimum level of proficiency students who are not majoring in English should have to perform successfully. Being this, the B1 level.

4 CURRICULUM STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT OF THE IMPLEMENTED CBI MODEL

The theme-based model of the languages courses have been designed in order that a CBI course can effectively be implemented in EFL settings, especially in the context of UIN Suska Riau. In order to be a World-Class University, the Language Development Center of UIN Suska Riau must develop the curriculum targets from personal or general-related goals to academic or work-related goals. For that reason, the development of the curriculum targets requires the Language Development Center to link the three current levels to the CEFR levels which are structured for basic users through independent users of English. Therefore, the development provides a continuation of the implemented CBI courses and, consequently, a possibility to implement two other types of CBI, namely the Sheltered Model and the Adjunct Model. The curriculum standards development to be proposed by the Language Development Center (LDC) of UIN Suska Riau is depicted in the following matrix.

Continuation of the Implemented CBI Courses

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
IV (Threshold)	CEFR B1 (Independent user)	<p>9. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest.</p> <p><i>Mampu menghasilkan teks yang sederhana dan berhubungan dengan topik-topik yang sudah dikenal ataupun tentang minat pribadi.</i></p> <p>القدرة على انتاج النص البسيط المتعلق بالموضوعات المعروفة أو عن الهواية.</p> <p>10. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanation for opinions and plans.</p> <p><i>Mampu menjelaskan pengalaman dan peristiwa, impian, harapan, dan ambisi serta secara singkat memberikan alasan dan penjelasan untuk pendapat dan rencana.</i></p> <p>القدرة على شرح الخبرة، والحوادث، والأمل، والرجاء، والهمة. واستخدام الحجة والبيان عنها.</p>

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
V (Vantage)	CEFR B2 (Independent user)	<p>11. Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation.</p> <p><i>Mampu memahami ide-ide utama dari teks kompleks baik yang bertopik konkrit maupun abstrak, termasuk diskusi-diskusi teknik di bidang spesialisasinya.</i></p> <p>القدرة على فهم الفكرة الرئيسية من النصوص المركبة إما بموضوع مركب وإما مجملاً، وشامل على المناقشة عن خاصيته.</p> <p>12. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation.</p> <p><i>Mampu berinteraksi dengan tingkat kelancaran dan spontanitas yang membuat interaksi umum dengan penutur asli terjadi tanpa tekanan bagi salah satu pihak termasuk diskusi teknis di bidang spesialisasinya.</i></p> <p>القدرة على المعاملة واتصال البليغ وارتجاليا الذي جعل الاتصال بين المتكلم العام والمتكلم الأهلّي واقع على سبيل مرتاح. وهذا يشمل على المناقشة عن الأشياء في خاصيته.</p>
VI (Vantage)	CEFR B2 (Independent user)	<p>13. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects including subjects in his/her specialisation and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</p> <p><i>Mampu menghasilkan teks yang jelas dan rinci tentang berbagai subjek, termasuk di bidang spesialisasinya dan menjelaskan sudut pandang tentang isu-isu-topikal untuk menyampaikan manfaat dan mudarat dari berbagai pilihan.</i></p> <p>القدرة على إنتاج النصوص الواضحة والتفصيلية عن المباحث الكثيرة شامل على خاصيته وشرح على الفكرة عن الموضوعات لتبليغ منافعها وضرورتها.</p>
VII (Effective Operational Proficiency)	English or Arabic Proficiency Tests	<p>14. Can achieve an average IELTS score between 6.0 and 6.5 (with a minimum of 5.0 in all four skills) or 525-575 in paper-based TOEFL or TOAFL.</p> <p><i>Mampu mencapai skor rata-rata IELTS antara 6.0 dan 6.5 (dengan skor minimum 5.0 untuk</i></p>

Level	Curriculum Target	Performance Indicators
		<p><i>setiap keterampilan berbahasa) atau skor 525-575 untuk hasil tes TOEFL atau TOAFL.</i></p> <p>القدرة على اكتساب النتيجة المتعادلة للإختبار IELTS من 6.0 حتى 6.5 (بأقل النتيجة هي 5.0 لكل المهارات اللغوية) أو النتيجة المعادلة TOEFL أو TOAFL للإختبار 525-575</p>

5 CONCLUSION

The implementation of the CBI courses in the Language Development Center requires a dynamic process because the implemented model has to keep up with new challenges to be aligned with the curriculum standards and the students' needs. In the Language Development Center, the university students have been provided with theme-based CBI courses for three levels during three semesters. In the theme-based CBI model, the students learn English for personal or general-related goals. The challenges to be a World-Class University and the students' needs to learn English for academic or work-related goals require a process of curriculum standards development. To meet the needs, it is recommended that the students are provided with three more levels that can be implemented through sheltered or adjunct CBI models in which the English lecturer is required to have a partnership with a content-area specialist. By taking and passing the total of the six-level courses, the students are allowed to take the last level for language classes, which is a level seven. In the level-seven course, they are trained and expected to show their effective operational proficiency by taking English proficiency test as one of the requirements for their graduation. It is hoped that the curriculum standards development as described in this article will lead to further research on the development of CBI models for Arabic and Indonesian courses.

REFERENCES

- Brinton, D. M., Snow, M.A., and Wesche, M. B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Bragger, J. D. & Rice, D. B. (1999). The message is in medium: A new paradigm for content-oriented instruction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 32(3), 373-391.
- Chapple, L. (1998). Film as content: An alternative approach. In *Proceedings of the 1998 Korea TESOL Conference—Advancing our profession: Perspectives on teacher development and education* (pp.1-8). Korea: KOTESOL.
- Crandall, J. & Tucker, G. R. (1990). "Content-Based Instruction in Second and Foreign Languages." In: Amado Padilla, Hatford H. Fairchild and Concepcion Valadez (eds.) *Foreign Language Education: Issues and Strategies*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Curtain, H. A. & Pesola, C. A. (1994). *Languages and Children: Making the Match*. New York: Longman.
- Duenas, M. (2004). A description of prototype models for content-based language instruction in higher education. *BELLS: Barcelona English Language and*

- Literature Studies, 12. Retrieved March 18, 2010, from <http://www.publicacions.ub.es/ revisites/bells12/PDF/art04.pdf>
- Genesee, F. (1994). *Integrating Language and Content: Lessons from Immersion*. Santa Cruz, CA: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.
- Heo, Y. (2006). Content-based instruction. *TESL Working Paper Series*, 4(2), 25-32.
- Howard, J. (2006). Models of Integrating Content and Language Learning. *Journal of the National Council of Less Commonly Taught Languages*. Vol 3, pp. 61-83.
- Kavaliauskiene, G. (2004). Research into the integration of content-based instruction into the ESP classroom. *Journal of Language and Learning*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Met, M. (1991). "Learning Language through Content: Learning Content through Language." *Foreign Language Annals*, 24: 281-295.
- Met, M. (1999). "Making Connections." In: June B. Phillips (ed.) *Foreign Language Standards: Linking Research, Theories, and Practices*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.
- Shaw, P. (1997). With one stone: Models of instruction and their curricular implications in an advanced content-based foreign language program. In S. Stryker, & B. Leaver (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in foreign language education*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Stoller, F. (2004). Content-based instruction: Perspectives on curriculum planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 261-283. The Education Resource Center of Senior High School. (2007).
- Wesche, M. B., & Skehan, P. (2002). Communicative, task-based, and content-based language instruction. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 207-228). New York: Oxford University Press.