Review research paper

ELP/LE FOR THE JUDICIARY: INTEGRATED INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN FOR AUTHENTIC LEARNING

Gordana Ignjatović

Faculty of Law, University of Niš, Serbia

Abstract. *This paper provides an insight into the instructional design of several tailor-made ELP/LE courses developed within the JA Project: English for the Judiciary (2017-2020). The courses were designed for adult working professionals from several judicial institutions in the City of Niš, organized at three CEFR proficiency levels, and held at the Judicial Academy Niš in the period 2018-2020. After a brief overview of the instructional design framework, the article outlines the major stages in the ELP/LE instructional design process, particularly focusing on the design and classroom practices in B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses. Based on the provided insights, the author examines the encountered challenges, learner benefits and considerations for prospective development of similar authentic learning courses for a wider discourse community.*

Key words*: Legal English, judiciary, integrated instructional design, authentic learning.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The judiciary is one of the priorities in the EU integration process, particularly in view of ensuring judicial cooperation with EU Member States and harmonizing judicial practices with EU standards. English for Legal Purposes (ELP) or Legal English (LE) has been an integral part of EU judicial education and training since 2011 (EJTN, 2012: 29).[1] As ELP/LE courses for the judiciary are quite rare in Serbia, the paper provides an insight into the instructional design of several tailor-made ELP/LE courses developed within the *Judicial Academy Project: English for the Judiciary* (2017-2020) and held on the premises of the Judicial Academy Niš[2] in the period 2018-2020. The ELP/LE courses were designed for adult judicial professionals (judges, prosecutors/deputy prosecutors, judicial/prosecutorial assistants, and JA trainees) from several institutions in the City of Niš,[3] organized at three CEFR proficiency levels (A1-A2, B1-B2, B2-C1), and delivered within the two-year project period. The JA Project was the result of cooperation between

[1] For more on LE training programs, see the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN, 2019).
[2] For more on the Judicial Academy activities, see: Pravosudna akademija/JA, 2022.
[3] The Basic/Municipal Court, the High/County Court, the Appellate Court, the Basic Prosecution Office, the Higher Prosecution Office, and the Judicial Academy in the City of Niš (Serbia)

several public, educational and judicial institutions,[4] and close collaboration of the core course-development team[5] (JA Project Proposal 2017).

The JA Project objectives were: a) to develop learners' content knowledge, communicative and professional competences; b) to facilitate the acquisition of learner/learning skills, transferable life skills for self-study, use of professional literature and resources; c) to support their professional development and participation in international seminars, projects, conferences; d) to strengthen their participatory capacity in judicial cooperation within the EU integration process; d) to promote learner autonomy and life-long learning for professional purposes (JA Project Proposal 2017). The instructional design was based on the tenets of the *Integrated Communicative Learning*,[6] authentic law-and-language learning[7], promoting the development of global and digital competences, and comprehensive inquiry-based instructional design approach.

Instructional design (ID) is *a scientific discipline* which applies different tenets of *learning*, *curriculum design,* and *instructional design theories* (Reigeluth, 2001:12-14)[8] to specify different stages and procedures in the multidimensional *process* of planning, devising, developing, managing, implementing and evaluating learner/learning-centered instruction the context-driven (Wagner, 2018:2) by using different ID approaches[9]. The goal/process/ performance/product-oriented instructional design is a collaborative effort to provide a meaningful, dynamic, adaptable and effective instruction, based on prior research, inquiry-based needs and goals analysis, a flexible and effective delivery system (instructional goals/outcomes, strategies, materials, procedures, educational technology; lesson planning, classroom management, assessment, evaluation), and effective implementation and intervention (Morrison, Ross, Kalman, Kemp, 2012:6-7). As such, it is the key instrument in creating meaningful, interactive and challenging learning environments promoting communication, collaboration, critical thinking and creativity.

In this paper, the author shares the valuable experiences and insights from the *JA Project: ELP/LE for the Judiciary* (2017-2020), aimed at facilitating authentic learning for adult working professionals in the workplace-based learning context, The paper sums

---

[4] The JA Project included: the Faculty of Philosophy Niš/English Department (project holder), the Judicial Academy Niš (beneficiary), the US State Department (sponsor), US Embassy Belgrade/Cultural Office (coordinator), the Regional English Language Office/RELO Belgrade (support/supervision), and a team of ELT/ESP/ELP/LE practitioners.

[5] The core project team included: an external LE Specialist/expert in LE instructional design, an ELT/ESP lecturer from the English Department, an ESP/ESS lecturer from the English Language Center at the Faculty of Philosophy Niš, an ESP/ELP/LE lecturer from the Law Faculty Niš, and the project initiator–a Municipal Court judge as the representative of the discourse community.

[6] For more on the Integrated Communicative Learning in ELP/LE, see: Ignjatović, 2020. This approach has been embraced by EU institutions committed to high-quality LE training (e.g. EULETA/EU Legal English Teachers Association, ERA/European Law Academy, EJTN/European Judicial Training Network, Translegal/International Legal English/ILEC) (E-Justice, 2022).

[7] For more on Authentic Learning in ELP/LE contexts, see: Ignjatović 2020: 373.

[8] *Learning theories* (behaviorist, cognitive, constructivist, communicative, collaborative) provide theoretical/ pedagogical/methodological descriptions of different aspects of learning. C*urriculum design theories* provide the structural framework for putting theory into practice (content knowledge/competences/values; goals/objectives/ outcomes; syllabus/material selection, design, development; assessment). *Instructional design theories* develop practical step-by-step approaches to delivering effective instruction and optimizing performance (Reigeluth, 2001:12-14).

[9] ID models (ADDIE, ASSURE, Backward Design, Universal Design for Learning, etc.) reflect different instructional design considerations: e.g. ADDIE (analysis, design, development, implementation, evaluation); for more, see: Educational Technology, 2015.

up the major instructional design stages (Needs Analysis, Curriculum/Syllabus/Material Design, Lesson Planning, Course Implementation, Assessment and Course Evaluation), with specific reference to instructional practices in B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses. Based on the course evaluation results and final project results, the author indicates the key challenges, benefits and considerations for prospective instructional design in developing similar ELP/LE courses for a wider discourse community.

2. INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN IN THE JA PROJECT: ELP/LE FOR THE JUDICIARY (2017-2020)

The JA Project: ELP/LE for the Judiciary was initially envisaged as a one-year project (2018-2019), which was to include two ELP/LE courses (at B1 and B2 level) held over two semester.[10] However, as the initial analysis revealed that many applicants were false beginners, the sponsors approved three courses (at A1, B1 and B2 CEFR). Based on the learners' interest and course evaluation results, the JA Project was subsequently extended (by sponsor's courtesy) for another year (2019-2020).

This part of the article outlines the major stages in the instructional design within the *JA Project: ELP/LE for the Judiciary* (2017-2020), including an overview of activities. For structural clarity, the elaborate process will be presented within three subheadings: 1) Pre-Implementation stage, 2) Implementation stage, and 3) Post-Implementation stage.

2.1. Pre-implementation Stage (October 2017- January 2018)

The core project team first met in early October 2017 to discuss the project proposal (stakeholders' interests, learner profile, plan, goals, curriculum, materials, assessment), schedule events for the initial stage, make arrangements and assign individual tasks.

The Pre-Implementation Stage included three correlated phases and related activities, aimed at collecting quantitative/qualitative data to inform curriculum/syllabus/material design.

I Data-based Research and Inquiry-based Analysis

1. *Preliminary Survey* **(PS)** on prospective learners' interests in ELP/LE courses;
   aim: to check on interest and self-assessed proficiency level
2. *Collecting sample materials***:** legal texts, documents, cases, videos, online resources;
   aim: to perform initial genre analysis, text/language/competence analysis, task analysis;
3. *Needs Analysis* **(NA):** preparation, revisions, distribution, data collection and analysis;
   aim: to collect data on prior learning, needs/wants, likes/preferences, expectations;[11]
4. *Focus Group Meeting* at JA with prospective learners: *aim:* to introduce the project; make arrangement for PT and OI; promote collaborative mindset, discuss interests, etc;
5. *Placement Test* **(PT):** preparation, revision, distribution, grading, ranking into groups;
   aim: to check on learners prior knowledge for preliminary grouping; [12]

---

[10] The course design specifics included: 60 one-hour classes (15 weeks, 2 hours/week, 30h/term) over two semester (January-June 2018, September 2018-Januuary 2019), minimum 15 learners per course.

[11] The extensive *NA Questionnaire* included: 1) Personal data; 2) Previous EL learning; 3) Current/future EL use; 4) Learner/Learning needs; 5) ELP course needs: a) GE skills; b)Academic English; c) Legal English; d) Professional Skills; 6) Assessment: Tests, Grading; 7) Comments.

[12] The *Placement Test* (60 pts) included: 1) GE Grammar & Structures (A1- C1): multiple choice (40 pts); 2) ELP Reading Text: Trial by Jury-multiple choice (20 pts).

6. ***Semi-structured Oral Interview* (OI):** preparation, revision, interviews, grouping;
aim: to check on communication proficiency, fluency, accuracy, interaction; double-check the CEFR level; fine-tune grouping (for borderline learners: A2/B1, B1/B1);[13]
7. ***Focus Group Meeting with LE Specialist and RELO Officer***: final check on NA findings, professional needs/interests, commitment, text types, integrated approach, etc.

Based on the extensive assessment (PT, OI), learners (N=81 in total) were grouped into relevant courses (A1=26; B1=28; B1+/B2=26). The inquiry-based analysis (NA, FGMs) provided valuable insights for further present and target learning analysis in each group.

II Teacher Training and Curriculum/Syllabus/Material Design (team work)

The next step was the ***Teacher Training*** (TT) with external LE Specialis**t,** which was a platform from ESP knowledge and experience exchange, promoting the collaborative mindset, getting the core team members on the same page in terms of ELP/LE theory, methodology, pedagogy and practice, and tackling ***Curriculum/Syllabus/Material design*** issues. To this effect, the TT Agenda included discussions on a range of relevant topics:

1. ***Course contents:*** Ls interests, content areas, social/legal issues, legal topics, procedures; exploring, gathering and selecting relevant materials; legal genres, types of texts (newspaper/academic articles, cases, legal documents, judgments, reports, charts, videos);
2. ***Course goals/objective/outcomes and forms of assessment***: a) general goals (communication, integrated skills, functional grammar), b)specific goals (academic, research, digital skills), c) professional goals (legal terms, genres, lawyer skills, legal culture,); d) formative/summative assessment (tests, quizzes, feedback, performance checklists-rubrics);
3. ***Theoretical/methodological/pedagogical considerations:*** genre and corpus analysis; communicative competences, discursive (lawyer) skills, global competences, transactional life skills; learner/learning skills; adult learning issues;
4. ***Educational technology***: use of technology, available online resources (cases, documents, YouTube videos, Ted Talk presentations); PowerPoint presentations; digital skills (legal research), legal databases (EUR-Lex, HUDOC training); digital tools (Quiz let, Jeopardy);
5. ***Curriculum design approach and procedures***: course structure, sequencing contents, setting goals/outcomes; lesson planning, activity types (integrated skills, functional grammar, social/professional communication, role-play, problem-solving, case studies, presentations, scenarios, projects); learning strategies; classroom management; assessment and evaluation;
6. ***Course syllabus:*** integrated syllabus: content/topic/task/skills/function-based; authentic content/competence-based approach; listing goals/outcomes, sequencing topics, activities, integrated receptive/productive skills, functional grammar; legal culture, lawyer skills**;**
7. ***Material selection, development and adaptation:*** a fair balance of GE, Academic English and LE contents/skills/values; variety of relevant manageable material); sequencing (by week); text adaptation or support (transcripts, subtitles) for lower levels;
8. ***Lesson planning and Activities***: lesson structure, sequencing activities, task analysis; classroom management; variety of tasks/activities, reference charts (e.g. language functions, grammar) and samples (letters, conversation strategies, etc.);
9. ***Assessment and Evaluation:*** evidence-based learning, summative/formative assessment: tests, quizzes, revision games; checklists, rubrics, graphic tools; self/peer evaluation, etc.

---

[13] The *Oral Interview* (40pts) included: 1) Interview questions; 2) A1-C1 speaking descriptors; 3) Checklist (structures, vocabulary, interaction); 4) Assessment Sheet (1-5); 5) Ranking scale (A1-C1).

Considering that instructional design is goal/process/performance/product-oriented, course/syllabus/material development is a dynamic, flexible and negotiated process. Learner needs vary and present/target learning situations impacts instructional decisions. As nothing is set in stone, instructional design should allow for necessary change, adaptation, revision and fine-tuning. Thus, the general course/syllabus/material design structure and the common core syllabus produced by the project team in TT sessions was just a general framework (with guidelines) for further development of course-specific syllabi in line with the instructional situation observed in each course.

III Curriculum/Syllabus/Material Development for B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses

Relying on this elaborate structural framework, each course facilitator was to revisit the NA results for a specific group, conduct further analysis, revise the draft curriculum, create the course syllabus and develop/adapt the materials and activities to the specific proficiency level and learner needs, goals and interests. This section illustrates the Course/Syllabus/Material Development for B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 groups.

At intake, the NA analysis on B1+/B2 learners yielded the following results:

a) *Target Learner Analysis* (TLA): relatively consistent age group (25-40), highly motivated mixed ability learners; different professional profiles (3 judges, 3 prosecutors, 10 assistants, 10 trainees) from different institutions (courts, prosecution, JA) with heavy workload; different professional interests (criminal/civil law, international/EU law, human rights) for current/prospective GE/EAP/LE purposes; dislike of summative assessment (formal tests);

b) *Present Situation Analysis* (PSA): different prior GE/LE exposure, learning gaps; different perceptions on strengths/weaknesses, different communicative competences, some/no exposure to academic/professional skills; insufficient awareness of lexical/genre/discourse analysis, GE/AE/LE writing conventions; different learning styles, strategies, motivation, engagement; possible assignment completion issues, classroom management/dynamics, power relations; need for highly practical, meaningful, authentic, differentiated/negotiated learning;

c) *Learning Context Analysis* (LCA): face-to-face instruction on the JA premises, traditional classroom (desks), low-tech environment (laptop, loudspeakers, Flip chart/whiteboard OHP), no stable Internet; paper-based instruction (handouts) supported by computer-based PPT presentations and some JA tech support; classes within working hours (at 8am or 14pm); strict observance of one-hour class time due to Ls busy daily routine and JA training timetable.

In addition to multidimensional law-and language contents (GE, EAP, LE), discursive competences and learner/learning considerations, the analysis revealed ample challenges that had to be accounted for in devising the relevant instructional approach. In order to provide highly meaningful, practical, authentic learning for adult working professionals, there was a need to incorporate the tenets of adult learning (andragogy)[14] and different instructional design approaches. Thus, the Course/Syllabus/Material Design for B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses was based on the **Integrated Instructional Design** approach, which entails a number of theoretical, methodological, pedagogical and practical underpinnings:

---

[14] For a summary on andragogical approach to adult learning, see*:* Bugreeva, 2019: 414-419.

1) Integrated approach to course design:
- *Integrated communicative learning*: eclectic and holistic learning approach: content-based, task-based, experiential learning, integrated-skills, functional grammar);
- *Learner/learning-based instruction*: relevant methodology and andragogy; "learner training", "learning to learn" skills; learner independence and autonomy;
- *Authentic learning:* meaningful, purposeful learning for real-world purposes (authentic methodology, goals/outcomes, material/activities, competences/practices, assessment);
- *Negotiated learning:* consider Ls preferences, choices, feedback; issues/difficulties
- *Differentiated learning*: flexible, individual approach to material design, lesson planning, diversity of tasks/activities, taking into account different likes/wants/interests;
- *Evidence-based learning*: reliable, measurable summative/formative assessment tools
- *Developing digital competences*: use of technology for real-life professional purposes.

2) Integrated approach to syllabus design: the Integrated Syllabus

Instructional design inevitably makes use of several types of syllabi: in GE, it entails linguistic/functional/notional/content/topic/task/skills/learning-based syllabi; in ESP, the list is further embellished by specific lexical/genre/discourse-based syllabus components. In order to facilitate meaningful and effective authentic law-and-language learning, B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses were based on the **Integrated Syllabus** for several reasons:
- *pragmatics and flexibility for negotiated learning*: it offers an opportunity to introduce eclectic elements of different syllabus types (as needed) and a flexible approach to negotiating the teaching/learning process by taking learners' perspectives into account;
- *multiple options for meaningful & differentiated learning*: a syllabus should reflect careful consideration, planning, integration of requisite content/competences/values by taking into account the specific circumstances, needs, preferences, individual differences;
- *tentativeness:* it sets the "approximate" learning journey; it may anticipate problems and set criteria and procedures for handling them but it is a model or "a statement of an ideal" (Hutchinson, Waters 1987:84); which will further evolve in the implementation stage;
- *the right balance for overall satisfaction/achievement*: it enables striking the proper balance between all components in creating a meaningful, practical, authentic instruction and constantly adjusting the initial syllabus to the in-course teaching/learning circumstances.

Given the diversity of content-specific interests expressed in NA (criminal/civil law, international/EU law, human rights), the integrated syllabus in the first term (January-June 2018) was based on an overarching topic (*domestic violence*) for all groups. This "easy start" was expected to provide sufficient latitude for addressing different aspects of law-and-language learning in all preferred legal areas, bridge the divide between different interests and ensure equal satisfaction by focusing on a relatively undemanding legal context, personalize and contextualize the issue by referring to the Serbian contexts, experiences and professional needs. It also provided sufficient space to revise the basic GE structures, introduce basic LE terminology, and focus on key professional skills. It also contributed to group building and cohesion, overcoming initial psychological hurdles pertinent to adult learning, and provided space for learner training, revisiting learning skills, integrated (reflective/productive) skills and functional grammar as the cornerstone for developing communicative, discursive and digital competences. Above all, it set standards for professional discussion, argumentation, exploring documents, case law, role-playing, etc. In the next term, the integrated syllabus included eclectic elements of content/topic/task/skills/function/competence-based syllabi, which focused on subject-specific areas of civil/criminal law, procedures in comparative legal systems (Serbian/EU), legal terminology, international documents and case law, global/discursive and digital competences (B1+/B2 Syllabus). In the second project year (2019-2020), the focus was

on the international issues in international criminal and civil law, professional development and judicial cooperation in civil and criminal matters, with specific reference to process and performance-based instructional approach (B2+/C1 Syllabus).

3) Mapping the B1+/B2 Syllabus: Sequencing learning events and activities

The next step was to produce a manageable course syllabus by sequencing integrated learning events into a logical order, incorporating all requisite elements: a) content areas, communicative competences (linguistic, socio-linguistic, strategic, discursive), transferable skills, global and digital competences, legal culture; b) instructional methodology (objectives/ goals/outcomes, processes); c) resources for material/task development; d) summative/ formative assessment tools (tests, quizzes, checklists, rubrics, self/peer evaluation); e) classroom management (interactions, grouping, difficulties, solutions); f) implementation considerations, adjustments, negotiated and differentiated instruction.

4) Material Design/Development & Lesson Planning

In ESP contexts, course/syllabus/material design and lesson planning are often driven by the collected material and available resources. These processes are correlated and constantly evolve in this interaction. They have to be systematic, logical and coherent, integrating all theoretical/methodological/pedagogical and pragmatic elements reflecting the holistic and humanistic teaching/learning process. To ensure purposeful and effective instruction, teachers commonly see material design in terms of *manageable lesson:* what is possible in the specific circumstances and given time. Lesson plans lay down the organization of the teaching/learning process but they are tentative as they may be further adjusted in line with specific goals, materials, learner/learning needs, observed difficulties, external/internal factors, etc. The key to good material design is "*chunking*", organizing tasks in manageable chunks which are not stand-alone activities but integrated into a meaningful whole. Law commonly features lengthy texts (cases, judgments) which have to be split into manageable parts with different focal points (e.g. integrated skills: reading/listening followed by speaking/writing; functional grammar; lexical/genre/discourse analysis; legal argumentation, mock-trial simulation, etc.). Thus, material design and lesson plans in B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses were based on several approaches:

a) *Authentic learning approach:* include authentic/discourse-specific content knowledge, competences, values; processes/methods/strategies, texts/tasks/activities, goals/assessment;

b) *Learner/learning-based approach:* align material/ tasks/activities with learner/learning needs, taking into account possible challenges, internal and external factors, etc

c) *Content-based approach:* explore the collected material and other resources, read texts and critically assess their practical value/applicability/adaptability (to a lower A1-B1 level); identify lexical, linguistic, structural, strategic, sociolinguistic, cultural, discursive, digital elements or text potentials (e.g. current ethical/social/cultural issues, affective impact, etc.);

d) *Task-based approach:* make a logical/coherent sequence of manageable tasks; specify goals/aims, aligned aims with outcomes/assessment; correlate with tasks in the next unit;

e) *Competence-based approach:* identify requisite competences, devise activities/tasks focusing on goals/outcomes and ensuring a good balance of communicative competences (socio-linguistic, discursive, functional, strategic), global/transferable life skills, digital competences; tasks should be practical, meaningful, educational, enjoyable, increasingly challenging (difficult), moving from reception to production and performance.

In the implementation stage, the developed materials, lesson plans and activities are further adjusted to specific teaching/learning circumstances, which calls for good classroom management skills, flexibility, patience, empathy and consideration of psychological/ affective, personal/family, internal/institutional and external/social factors.

5) Assessment and Course Evaluation

Assessment is another essential element which has to be incorporated into the course/syllabus/material design, lesson planning and individual activities from the start. It entails diverse *forms of assessment* (formal/informal; ongoing/periodic; preliminary/mid-term/end-term; summative/formative; self/peer/teacher/group/panel assessment) and a range of *assessment tools* for weighing content-knowledge, competences and abilities at different stages of the process (reception, performance and production). Some of these *evidence-based learning* tools are: progress/final tests; quizzes, surveys/questionnaires; formal/informal feedback; checklists/rubrics; performance criteria/standards/procedures; individual/group/class assignments and discussions; etc. Notably, a vast majority of B1+/B2 learners explicitly opted to have no formal summative assessment (tests) and no formal grading (marks). The learners' choice may be explained by a number of reasons: no test pressure and frustration with negative results; traditional cultural attitudes to strict formal testing requirements; reluctance to be perceived as "pupils" who will be graded; wish to enjoy the learning process rather than compete with others; the habit of having professional seminars with rather relaxed attendance and participation criteria, where they are not graded but receive attendance certificates. Therefore, an additional challenge in B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses was to ensure evidence-based learning by devising alternative and flexible but still reliable and measurable formative assessment options.

Depending on learners' engagement and performance, the JA project envisaged the possibility of obtaining one of the two certificates: a certificate of completion (75% attendance and 60% task completion) or a certificate of attendance (50% attendance and 30% task completion). Thus, instead of being formally graded, learners had to meet the specific percentage requirements in order to be awarded a certificate. The B1+B2 and B2+/C1 courses included attendance sheet as a quantitative tool for recording attendance and a number of designated production/performance activities which were assessed by using diverse formative assessment tools, depending on the assignment-specific criteria. Although they did not have formal tests and grades, learners were exposed to different forms of formative assessment: periodic group (jeopardy-style) quizzes on content knowledge and skills; teacher-assessed class activity and writing assignments (letters, academic abstracts, case briefs); peer-assessed presentations and simulations (based on process-specific checklists or rubrics (genre moves); individual consultations/group discussions; formal/informal peer/teacher feedback; self-assessment (competency-based checklist); course evaluation surveys; etc. Thus, learners' production and performance were assessed throughout the teaching/learning process on the basis of completed assignments, which were transferred into percentages and used in rendering a data-based decision on whether the learner met the course criteria for being awarded a certificate.

Course evaluation is time for reflection on learning experience and performance. It is valuable for learners and teachers alike. It gives learners a chance to assess different aspects of the teaching/learning process by filling out mid-term/end-term surveys.[15] It is also an opportunity to focus on processes, production and performance, to recall and

---

[15] The B1+/B2 and B2/C1 Course Evaluation sheet included a number of indicators, which were assessed on 1-5 scale (course content/structure/organization: material, recourses, videos, handouts, tasks/activities; classroom management: learning atmosphere, teacher-students/student-student interactions; provided support/instructions/guidelines, teacher/peer feedback; personal progress/overall satisfaction) and an open-ended chart for comments (likes/dislikes/suggestions). The surveys could be submitted in paper form (unnamed) or sent via email (named). Most respondents sent them by mail.

critically evaluate applicability and effectiveness of provided instruction and one's own commitment, achievements and personal satisfaction. For teachers, it is crucial in terms of grooming learner awareness of instructional processes, putting learners in control and taking responsibility for their learning, and promoting mutual trust, partnership and collaboration which are highly important in adult classrooms. In B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 courses, evaluation results were also used as a starting point for discussion on observed problems and possible solutions. It was a chance to observe the challenges, regroup, remedy some shortcomings and address them in the forthcoming period. The learner group meeting at the outset of the second project year (2019-2020) was an additional opportunity to hear learner needs, negotiate content areas for prospective work and adjust the course/syllabus/material design, lesson plans, classroom management and assessment.

2.2. Implementation Stage: Classroom Practices in B1+/B2 course

Drawing on the course/syllabus/material design, the implementation stage included: lesson planning, material development, classroom management and practices.[16] A typical *lesson plan* included: a warmer or introduction into the topic, content-specific reading/listening/watching task, discussing related social/legal issues, exploring functional grammar, lexical/genre/ discourse analysis, production/performance activity. The instruction included various *types of integrated communicative learning activities* devised to cater for diverse student needs, learning aptitudes and multiple intelligences: a) Warm-up tasks (songs, visuals, videos); b) Vocabulary/Pronunciation tasks; c) Functional grammar tasks; d) Legal terminology (gap-filling, matching, ranking/ordering activities); e) Legal forms, reports, documents; f) Reading/ listening/watching videos with note-taking, summarizing, drawing conclusions; g) Speaking: group discussions, mini-presentations; h) Homework assignments: individual/pair reading/ listening, speaking/writing tasks; database search; i) Language games (revision quizzes, jeopardy, board games); j) Jigsaw activates: hypothetical cases/scenarios, role-play; k) Group/ class projects and peer evaluation; l) Mock trial/Moot court simulations; etc.[17] The authentic tasks/activities were sequenced from receptive to productive ones. Some of the student-generated materials (poster-presentations, abstracts, cases) were subsequently used for discussion, revision and error-correction purposes. Some of the culminating production activities were: letter writing, academic abstract writing, CV and Motivation Letter writing, case summary, content/competences revision quizzes, etc. Some of the culminating performance activities included: mini poster-presentations (Serbian courts), round table discussions (judicial cooperation), problem-solving scenarios (domestic violence), PTT presentations on a chosen EU/Serbian case, legal argumentation (case analysis), end-term Mock Trial project (B1+/B2 course) and Moot Court project (B2+/C1 course), where learners demonstrated a comprehensive set of discursive competences (legal research, case analysis, legal interpretation, legal argumentation/representation skills, legal reasoning, judgment/ adjudication) in discourse-specific judicial contexts. Both courses endeavored to promote learners' awareness about life-long learning opportunities for the judiciary and ongoing

---

[16] Some B1+/B2 course materials and activities were presented in the *ELP/LE Workshop: JA English for the Judiciary,* at the ESP Conference Niš, on 22 September 2022.
[17] For more on authentic Integrated Communicative MI-based Activities, see: Ignjatović, 2017.

ELP/LE professional development opportunities provided via professional networks.[18] In addition, all ELP/LE learners had a chance to attend several workshops given by guest lecturers.[19] Both courses were subject to external supervision by the RELO officer and sponsor representatives, who visited and observed a number of classes.

For the purposes of this article, we may briefly refer to the quantitative results achieved in the B1+/B2 and B2/C1 courses over the two-year period. *Table 1* shows that more than half of the initial number of applicants completed each course (57,68% and 55%, respectively). In both courses, the number of learners who attained a certificate of completions is significantly higher than those who attained a certificate of attendance. As for the learners who were below the criteria or quit, the teacher's records shows that there were ample justifiable reasons why they could not keep up the pace.[20] On the whole, as all learners were busy professionals who had to handle the heavy professional workload, family circumstances and a new learning environment at the same time, they should be commanded for their perseverance, resilience, commitment, achievements and the best efforts to keep up with the demanding B1+/B2 and B2/C1 course requirements.

Table 1. Learners' Achievements in B1+/B2 and B2/C1 courses (2018-2020)

Course	Certificate of Completion	Certificate of Attendance	Below criteria/Quit	Certificates
2018-2019	75% attendance; 60% task completion	50% attendance; 30% task completion		10.2.2019
B1+/B2 (26)	14 (53.84%)	1 (3.84%)	8+3q =11(42.3%)	15/26
2019-2020				10.2.2020
B2/C1 (20)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	11/20

Source: JA Project end-course reports (January 2019, January 2020), table prepared by the author

In addition, we may briefly refer to the qualitative part of B1+/B2 course evaluation, which assessed learners' likes, dislikes and suggestions for improvement. The collected results indicate learners' *high satisfaction* with different aspects of instruction: a) course material (content areas/topics/issues; interesting/informative videos; useful legal terms, grammar revision); b) course structure/organization and classroom management (integrated skills, multitasking, instructions, unobtrusive error correction; manageable assignments); c) learning atmosphere (relaxed, comfortable, supportive, motivating, involving, challenging, inspiring); d) teacher-student interactions (commitment, collaboration; supportive, flexible, professional attitude); d) student-student interactions (friendship, mutual respect, equality, exchange of knowledge/experiences/skills); e) feedback (useful, practical, accurate oral/written support); f) personal progress/learning/satisfaction (new knowledge, terminology, professional development/life skills; improved vocabulary/ pronunciation, grammar, speaking/writing skills). The encountered *challenges* were largely

---

[18] See professional networks and learning hubs: European Judicial Training Network(EJTN), E-Justice portal, etc. In 2021, three JA trainees (two B2+/C1 learners) won the first prize in the EJTN Themis *Access to Justice* Competition (16. Dec. 2021, Lisbon, Portugal). See: EJTN, 2022.

[19] The presentation/discussion topics covered: Whistleblowing (US human rights expert/advocate); American court system (ELF, former court intern), and Police in the USA (ELF, ESP practitioner).

[20] The B1+/B2 and B2+/C1 course statistical data indicate that 10 learners reported having heavy workload; 2 learners were preparing their bar exam; 5 learners were on one-year maternity leave; 1 learner had a serious health condition; 4 learners who comleted the first course but did not join the second course; 3 learners who quit the first course were referred to join a lower group.

related to the novelty of instructional approach, challenging syllabus and limited time frame, complexity of content areas and more time for in-depth coverage, need for learner training (active listening, turn-taking), busy professional/personal life. difficulty in keeping pace with course requirements and no time to regularly attend, revise and complete assignments. Learners' *suggestions* included: more focus on Serbian legal context, content-specific issues (legal institutes, procedures, competences); more videos, competitive and writing tasks; more learner activity/interaction; less homework*;* better handouts organization, sending material via email*;* better resources (whiteboard not flipchart, stable Internet access), etc. They were highly motivated to keep on learning in the next term (B1+/B2 Course Evaluation, Jan.2019).

2.3. Post-Implementation Stage

At the end of the first term, team members submitted class reports, reviewed course evaluation sheets, and embarked on preparing the syllabus/material for the next term. At the outset of the next term, the B1+/B2 teacher organized a learner group meeting to review the proposed syllabus/material contents and negotiate improvements. At the end of the first project year (Jan.2019), learners were awarded their completion/attendance certificates, and further arrangements were made for the second project year. At the outset of the second project year, the pre-course activities (NA, PT, OI) were repeated for newcomers. The B2+/C1 course teacher organized a learner group meeting to revise the proposed syllabus in line with learner needs. The implementation stage was a new opportunity to fine-tune the instructional design. At the end of the second project year (Jan.2020), learners received their completion/attendance certificates.

Finally, we may briefly refer to the statistical data from the two-year project period. *Table 2* demonstrate learners' achievements in all ELP/LE course with the JA project.

Table 2. Learners' Achievements in ELP/LE courses within the JA project (2018-2020)

Course	Certificate of Completion	Certificate of Attendance	Below criteria/Quit	Certificates	Total %
2018-2019	75% attendance; 60% task completion	50% attendance; 30% task completion		58	
A1+/A2 (26)	12 (46.15%)	9 (34.61%)	3+2q=5 (19,23%)	21/26	
A2+/B1 (29)	7 (24,15%)	15 (51,72%)	7 (24,13%)	22/29	71.6%
B1+/B2 (26)	14 (53.84%)	1 (3.84%)	8+3q=11 (42.3%)	15/26	
2019-2020				28	
A2/A2+ (18)	7 (38,88%)	6 (33,33%)	5 (27,7%)	13/18	
B1/B1+ (17)	4 (23,52%)	/	/	4/17	50.9%
B2+/C1 (20)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	9 (45%)	11/20	

Source: JA Project end-course reports (January 2019, January 2020), table prepared by the author

Based on these final ELP/LE course results, we may notice that the initial applicants' interest exceeded the project proposal expectations, as learners rushed to take advantage of this unique learning opportunity, the first of that kind in this region. Notably, the total number of applicants (81) and accomplished course participants (58) was much higher in the first project year than in the second project year (55 applicants and 28 accomplished participants). The achievement averages (71,6% in the first project year and 50.9% in the second project year) show that the JA project was a highly meaningful form of ELP/LE learning for a majority of learners. The number of those who did not meet the set criteria or quit indicates the difficulties they had in keeping pace and handling their heavy professional workload, family life and ELP/LE training. The two-year period of intensive LE training may have exhausted the learners and caused burnout, which ultimately resulted in lower

interest, attendance, completion and final project results in the second project year. On the whole, all learners must be commanded for their commitment, perseverance, resilience, achievements and best efforts to keep up with the demanding course requirements. For the B1+/B2 and B2/C1 teacher, the entire instructional design process and classroom practices were a highly challenging and labor-intensive but valuable and ultimately rewarding teaching/learning experience, which offered a chance to step out of the ELP/LE academic classroom and experience the real world of ELP/LE for specific professional purposes.

3. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Given the relevance of ELP/LE training for professional development purposes, the *JA Project: English for the Judiciary* (2017-2020) provided a unique opportunity to adult working professionals to attend ELP/LE courses specifically tailored for the judiciary. This paper has provided some insight into the major stages in the instructional design process and a glimpse into the theoretical-methodological framework and classroom practices in two LE courses (at B1+/B2 and B2+/C1), including course evaluation on observed benefits, challenges, and suggestions for improvement. In that context, we can draw some conclusions which may be valuable in designing prospective ELP/LE courses.

There is no doubt that the beneficiary's initiative, the project holder's assistance and the sponsor's decision to support this form of learning deserve the highest praise, particularly considering that it was the first-ever ELP/LE project in this region specifically tailored for the judiciary. Yet, one-time learning experience is hardly sufficient. The obvious relevance of ELP/LE courses was clearly illustrated by the fact that the core project team received a number of inquiries (from administrative court staff, practicing lawyers and administrative staff) about the likelihood of joining ELP/LE courses or having a course for their professional purposes. This express interest may be a signpost for relevant stakeholders (policy/decision makers, sponsors, institutions facilitating ESP training, professional associations wishing to provide such training for their members) to facilitate more authentic learning opportunities for adult working professionals.

In order to ensure effective instructional design and its proper implementation, the entire process has to be performed in line with the highest ESP professional standards. ELP/LE courses must be designed and taught by a team of experienced practitioners. In that context, the extensive pre-implementation stage is the fundamental, highly valuable and effective part of the instructional design; it ensures requisite teacher training and yields a general reference framework which may be used in creating new ESP courses. For all teachers, it was a challenging and labor intensive but professionally valuable and rewarding experience. While the first term syllabus was prepared jointly, this process was not repeated in subsequent terms. As teachers had to attend to their regular professional duties throughout the project period, their decisions and multitasking activities were driven by tight deadlines. The challenges, considerations and hurdles encountered in the implementation stage were largely resolved by teachers and students. Some dilemmas could be more efficiently addressed by the entire team, and a more constructive support of the host institution. Some technical, learning and classroom management issues may be resolved by investing into educational technology and digital infrastructure promoting learning in workplace contexts. In the author's opinion, the entire process should involve close collaboration of team members throughout the project period.

On the whole, the final JA project results can be said to have been quite satisfactory. The course evaluation results show that the learners who completed the two-year courses were highly content with their ELP/LE learning experience. While all JA project participants should be commended for exerting their best efforts, juggling their heavy professional workload, personal/family life and LE course requirements, only the most committed ones reached the finish line. In order to preclude learners' exhaustion and burnout, these circumstances should be taken into account when designing similar ESP/ELP course for adult working professionals. While the sponsors certainly had justified reasons for organizing such intensive training within the given time frame, it might be more practicable and effective if learners had at least a six-month break between two course cycles, which would give them a chance to reflect, regroup and restore their initial law-and-language learning enthusiasm.

These findings show that there is plenty of room for further improvements in all aspects of instruction in order to ensure proper learning environment, relevant resources, trained teaching staff and relevant approach to authentic learning in workplace contexts. Considering the huge interest of judicial professionals in law-and-language learning for real-life professional purposes, the author urges relevant stakeholders to support the development of similar ELP/LE courses for different target groups (lawyers, administration, police, etc). These courses should be organized on a regular or periodic basis, within a reasonable time frame, taking into account a number of internal and external factors in the busy professional and personal life of adult working professionals. It might also be a good idea to establish an ESP center which would provide specialized language services for work-related purposes in different ESP areas, train and employ ESP practitioners to provide courses tailored to the needs of a specific discourse community.

REFERENCES

Hutchinson, T, Waters, A. (1987). English for Specific Purposes: A learning-centered approach, Cambridge/New York/Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1987

Morrison, G., Ross, S., Kaman, H., Kemp, J.(2012). Designing Effective Instruction, New Jersey: Wiley, 2012; accessed online (1.10.2022) https://books.google.rs/books/about/Designing_Effective_Instruction.html?id=ixJwDwAAQBAJ...

Reigeluth, Ch. M. (1999). What is Institutional design and how is it changing? In: *Instructional Design Theories and Models II, A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory* New Jersey/London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (pp.5-29) https://www.reigeluth.net/_files/ugd/4d4aa4_da82735337ee40bea371331caf762cb2.pdf

Wagner, E. (2018). What is this thing called Instructional Design? In: *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology: Historical roots and Current trends,* R. E. West (ed). EdTech Books; retrieved from https://edtechbooks.org/lidtfoundations; https://edtechbooks.org/pdfs/print/lidtfoundations/what_is_instructional_design.pdf

Bugreeva E. (2019*). Challenges and Solutions in Teaching Adults: An In-Company Course of English, The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes (ESP/EAP), Vol. 7, No 4, 2019, pp. 413-421; http://espeap.junis.ni.ac.rs/index.php/espeap/article/view/945/461

Ignjatović, G. (2020). Integrated Communicative Learning Approach in ELP practice: Practical application in the context of intra/multi/inter/transdisciplinary integration, *U:*

Зборник радова Правног факултета у Нишу/Collection of Papers of the Law Faculty, University of Niš, br.89/2020 (pp.369-388), ur.I. Pejic, Pravni fakultet, Niš, https://doi.org/10.5937/zrpfn0-29937

Ignjatović, G. (2017). Multiple Intelligences in ELP Instruction in Tertiary Education: Integrated Communicative MI-based Activities in Adult ELP/LE Classrooms, *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes* (ESP/EAP), Vol. 5, No 3, 2017 (pp. 567–587); http://espeap.junis.ni.ac.rs/index.php/espeap/article/view/569/344

Online sources

Educational Technology (2015). Instructional Design Models and Theories, S.Kurt; https://educationaltechnology.net/instructional-design-models-and-theories/ (accessed 30.9.2022).

E-Justice (2022). Training Methodology; https://e-justice.europa.eu/253/EN/training_methodology

European Judicial Training Network/EJTN (2012): EJTN 2011 Annual Report (p.29) https://www.ejtn.eu/Documents/About%20EJTN/EJTN%20Documentation/EJTN_Annual_Report_2011_A4.pdf

EJTN (2019): EJTN's 6 Linguistics Handbooks and Guides; https://www.ejtn.eu/News/Spotlight-EJTNs-6-linguistics-handbooks-and-guides/

EJTN (2021). EJTN Themis Competition, Official video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e_rsylXEwvs)

Pravosudna akademija/Judicial Academy (2022): About the Academy; Activity and Organization; https://www.pars.rs/en/o-akademiji-eng/delatnost-i-organizacija-pa-eng, https://www.pars.rs/en/o-akademiji-eng/rec-direktora-eng (accessed 30.9.2022).