

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #1

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

Section 3:

The data and analysis in this section is used to monitor continued compliance with specific standards.

3. A. Enrollment and faculty data and interpretation

The data in this section is used to monitor significant fluctuations in student and faculty numbers and to monitor continued compliance with specific standards.

3.A.1 Complete the table below.

	2014	2015	% Difference	NOTES/INSTRUCTIONS
Student weeks*	10520	6840	-35%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The formula for calculating student weeks is provided on p. 3 of the sustaining fee payment form. Please note that the term does NOT refer to the number of weeks of instruction. Please make sure that the number of student weeks matches the number on the sustaining fee form (for both years, if applicable).
Full-time faculty	4	4	0%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For all accredited programs, please specify the number of full-time faculty employed over the period of the reporting calendar year. Count the individuals, regardless of the number of sessions taught by him/her. Include full-time administrators if teaching is part of their work assignment.
Part-time faculty	34	25	-26%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each faculty member should be counted only once even if teaching in a number of sessions.

3.A.2 For any fluctuation in student and/or faculty numbers that is equal to or greater than 20% (as reported in 3.2.1), (i) explain the causes, and (ii) describe how the program or institution has addressed the fluctuation (facilities, student services, faculty, etc.). Provide a narrative explanation of any other significant changes in staffing, average class sizes, or part-time/full-time faculty ratios that your program experienced or implemented last year.

(If more space is needed, either expand the textbox or attach a separate file. If attaching a file, list the file name(s) below.)

Lower enrolment was mostly due to the decrease in the number of Kuwaiti scholarship students. The decrease affected many aspects of the school's operations.

(1) Some part-time faculty were not offered classes in the subsequent quarters. A few decided to leave while others remaining on as substitute faculty.

(2) Part-time staff are mostly-student assistants. There is some turnover with student assistants as their own education is their primary goal. Some decided to leave when their education conflicted with work hours. Some were not replaced as there was less need for this type of administrative work.

(3) Time spent on student services increased during this time as full-time personnel had more time to complete more thorough individual student advising.

(4) As for facilities, we moved to containing the classes within our dedicated XXX building classrooms and did not use other campus classrooms for regular class sessions.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #1

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

3. B. Student achievement data

The data in this section is used to verify student progression and pass rates as well as compliance with student achievement, length and structure, and program review and development standards.

3.B.1 Provide 2015 pass/fail data (or other numerical evidence of student achievement rates, such as progression rates) used by your program/institution to monitor the effectiveness of program length and structure.

PLEASE SEE P. 7 FOR INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS PART.

Background information

Our courses are 10-weeks long, with 20 hours of classroom instruction per week. For level completion, students must pass their courses with a score of at least 70% (C) and achieve the required score on the iTEP Academic-Plus exam given during weeks eight and nine of each term.

Students must achieve the following iTEP minimum scores to receive a certificate for the following levels:

- Level 1: 1.0
- Level 2: 1.5
- Level 3: 2.5
- Level 4: 3.0

Pass-fail data by skills area, level, and term

Pass Rates	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5		Avg.	St. Dev.
	LSR	WG	LSR	WG	LSR	WG	LS	RW	LS	RW		
WI 15	78.0%	68.2%	70.0%	74.0%	81.0%	74.0%	74.0%	83.0%	75.0%	58.0%	73.5%	0.07
SP 15	78.0%	70.0%	76.0%	79.0%	69.0%	61.0%	65.0%	62.0%	37.0%	54.0%	65.1%	0.13
SU 15	67.0%	38.0%	65.0%	77.0%	70.0%	69.0%	81.0%	86.0%	61.0%	81.0%	69.5%	0.14
FA 15	77.0%	83.0%	94.0%	94.0%	88.0%	79.0%	83.0%	78.0%	100.0%	82.0%	85.8%	0.08
Avg.	75.0%	64.8%	76.3%	81.0%	77.0%	70.8%	75.8%	77.3%	68.3%	68.8%	73.5%	0.05
St. Dev.	0.05	0.19	0.13	0.09	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.11	0.26	0.15	0.12	0.06

3.B.2 Provide an analysis of the data provided in 3.B.1 with respect to the consistency of pass rates across levels and/or skills areas and from session to session. If any problematic trends or inconsistencies have been identified, explain (a) what the program has done to identify the causes and (b) what follow-up actions have been or are being planned/implemented as part of the ongoing cycle of curriculum/assessment review.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #1

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

Overall, the school's pass rate average for levels 1-5 was 73.5% for the four quarters in 2015. The most fluctuations occurred in level 1 and level 5 as highlighted in the chart.

L1 WG Summer 2015

This particular quarter had few students across levels. Level 1 especially had small class size of 8. As depicted in the chart, this level had a very low pass rate of 38%. After a closer investigation, we discovered two causes: 1) zero beginners and 2) students transferring out. Two of the students were zero beginners and were not ready to enter our level 1. Two other students transferred out early in the quarter, thus skewing the pass rate further. Adjusted for the early exit factor, the ratio would be 50% and the standard deviation would fall from 0.19 to 0.14. If we adjust further for the zero beginners, the explanation of low pass rate is clearer. See actions below.

L5 LS and RW 2015

As seen in the chart, the rates vary throughout the four quarters. We have discovered many factors that have contributed to lower pass rates for level 5 students including: students who transferred out, motivation, student acceptance into University, time of year, as well as student burnout. Additionally, we have looked at evaluations to examine student satisfaction in this level indicating the previously stated factors. We have taken steps (noted below) to improve student attendance and interest in completing level 5.

Actions Taken:

As a result of quarterly analysis of pass rates, the program has updated procedures to provide for easier monitoring of student achievement. In addition to adding the quarterly student evaluations that had side-by-side reporting of grades, iTEP scores and attendance to facilitate easier comparison and identification of trends, we added the following:

- Increase norming sessions in-service teacher meetings.
- Systematic discussion of pass reports and iTEP scoring in interim level/curriculum meetings.
- Increased academic and attendance advising given by full-time teachers on a weekly basis.
- Developing and implementing a seminar specific to the needs of the low beginner students.
- Training on motivating students in the classroom.
- Revamping level 5 in anticipation of adding level 6 starting Winter 2016.

Future Actions:

Our students who have been conditionally accepted or are applying to the host University can use the completion of level 5 successfully as a TOEFL or IELTS waiver. In addition, those who want to go into graduate school will have the option of going into a new level 6 implemented in 2016. As seen in Fall 2015, this may be an incentive for students to successfully complete level 5 either to move to level 6 or to be able to waive the TOEFL or IELTS scores needed.

The program will continue to systematically discuss pass rates, curriculum, and have increased advising meetings in order to improve student learning.