

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

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	10,029	8512	-15%	<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	14	15	+7%	<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	57	50	-12%	<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.)

N/A

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.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND PROGRESSION RULES (EDITED)

Definition of pass

Passing is defined as achieving a final grade of B- or higher. Students are assessed in four skills areas (reading, writing, listening, speaking) and must MEET a majority of the SLOs in order to receive a passing grade and level promotion. MEETING the SLOs means 80% of the time in each skill area. EXCEEDING the SLOs means 90-100% of the time. PARTIALLY means anything less than 80%.

During the 14-week semester, the standard promotion, awarded to those students who MEET the majority of SLOs is one level (ex: from 4 to 5). Students who EXCEED the majority of SLOs may receive a two level promotion (ex: from 4 to 6), but such promotions are rare. Students who PARTIALLY meet the majority of SLOs do not receive a level promotion (though they may receive a 'sub-letter' promotion, ex: 4a to 4b) and receive a grade in the C range (with one exception – see below). While not a 'failing' grade, because of the lack of level promotion it is also not a true 'passing' grade.

Exit test and level promotion

At levels 7-9, and summer classes, all students complete a 105 minute Exit Test. Students read two short texts giving opposing views on the same subject and then write an argumentative essay stating which view they agree with. The essays are then read by a committee of full-time instructors. If the essay does not demonstrate sufficient progress to warrant a level promotion, instructors may submit backup essays as support. If students do not MEET the writing SLO, they cannot get a level promotion in levels 7-9. Because it's conceivable a student in levels 7-9 might MEET the reading, listening and speaking SLOS, but only PARTIALLY MEET the writing SLOs, the minimum grade with no promotion at these levels is B- not C. This recognizes achievement in the other three SLO areas.

Attachment: Chart that instructors use to determine grades and promotions

Pass/fail courses

The Winter Institute (2 weeks), Summer A (3 weeks), Summer B (4 weeks), and Summer C (4 weeks) are offered as Pass/Fail courses only. After such short courses, promotions in level are not expected; a student can pass yet not receive a promotion. To avoid only giving students PARTIALLY MEETS on their Student Achievement reports, from 2014 onwards, unlike Fall, Spring and XXP (name of program edited), instructors did not give E, P, M, D for each SLO, but rather indicated which SLO areas students had made progress in (indicated with a '+') and which areas they still needed to improve ('-').

However: students who take all three summer sessions (Summer A+B+C, for 11 weeks) are eligible to sit for a special program-wide achievement test. Based on the results of this, and on teacher recommendations, a level promotion may be awarded. Students may only be considered for promotion if they take the test. Because some choose not to, the data below only shows the numbers for those who actually tested (although more were eligible).

PASS-FAIL DATA

1. 2015 Progression rates by level and session: Spring, Fall and XXP

Because final grade is closely tied to progression through the program, but because at level 7+ it is possible to receive a 'passing' grade of B- with no level promotion, the data is below analyzed by progression rate (promotion level) rather than grade.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

The data includes:

- Spring and Fall semesters
- Summer XXP
- Those students who studied all 11 weeks in Summer A+B+C who took the final exam

	Level 1				Level 2		
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted		Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	8	6	75%	Spring	14	13	93%
XXP				XXP			
Summer ABC				Summer ABC			
Fall	12	9	75%	Fall	5	5	100%
2015 TOTAL	20	15	75%	2015 TOTAL	19	18	95%
	Level 3				Level 4		
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted		Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	14	11	79%	Spring	13	12	92%
XXP				XXP			
Summer ABC	9	7	78%	Summer ABC	4	3	75%
Fall	11	10	91%	Fall	31	28	90%
2015 TOTAL	34	28	82%	2015 TOTAL	48	43	90%
	Level 5				Level 6		
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted		Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	41	35	85%	Spring	38	35	92%
XXP				XXP	8	6	75%
Summer ABC	7	3	43%	Summer ABC	7	2	29%
Fall	42	39	93%	Fall	53	39	74%
2015 TOTAL	90	77	86%	2015 TOTAL	106	82	77%

	Level 7				Level 8		
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted		Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	41	26	63%	Spring	15	6	40%
XXP	14	3	21%	XXP	18	5	28%
Summer ABC	2	2	100%	Summer ABC			
Fall	49	32	65%	Fall	14	6	43%
2015 TOTAL	106	63	59%	2015 TOTAL	47	17	36%
	Level 9						
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted		Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	9	5	56%				
XXP	2	1	50%				
Summer ABC	1	1	100%				
Fall	8	2	25%				
2015 TOTAL	20	9	45%				

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

2015 TOTALS			
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Spring	193	149	77%
XXP	42	15	36%
Summer ABC	30	18	60%
Fall	225	170	76%
TOTAL	490	352	72%

2. Pass rates by level and session: Winter, Summer A, Summer B, Summer C

Because these courses are pass/fail only, and because no level promotion is given, they are analyzed separately, by pass rate per level and session.

	Level 1				Level 2		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass	Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
Winter				Winter	2	2	100%
Summer A	4	4	100%	Summer A	5	5	100%
Summer B	8	8	100%	Summer B	8	8	100%
Summer C	8	8	100%	Summer C	12	12	100%
2015 TOTAL	20	20	100%	2015 TOTAL	27	27	100%
	Level 3				Level 4		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass	Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
Winter	2	2	100%	Winter	3	3	100%
Summer A	16	15	94%	Summer A	6	6	100%
Summer B	16	15	94%	Summer B	12	12	100%
Summer C	26	26	100%	Summer C	28		0%
2015 TOTAL	60	58	97%	2015 TOTAL	49	21	43%

	Level 5				Level 6		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass	Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
Winter	3	3	100%	Winter	5	5	100%
Summer A	20	20	100%	Summer A	23	23	100%
Summer B	26	25	96%	Summer B	15	15	100%
Summer C	69	68	99%	Summer C	84	84	100%
2015 TOTAL	118	116	98%	2015 TOTAL	127	127	100%
	Level 7				Level 8		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass	Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
Winter	12	12	100%	Winter	4	4	100%
Summer A	18	18	100%	Summer A	15	15	100%
Summer B	21	21	100%	Summer B	10	10	100%
Summer C	77	76	99%	Summer C	56	55	98%
2015 TOTAL	128	127	99%	2015 TOTAL	85	84	99%

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

	Level 9		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
Winter	1	1	100%
Summer A	1	1	100%
Summer B			
Summer C	3	3	100%
2015 TOTAL	5	5	100%

	2015 TOTALS		
	Students	Promoted	% Promoted
Winter	32	31	97%
Summer A	108	107	99%
Summer B	116	114	98%
Summer C	363	332	91%
TOTAL	619	584	94%

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.

Two slightly problematic trends emerge from the data above. A third trend is being monitored, although the sample size is currently very small.

1. RATE OF PROMOTION SLOWS INTO LEVELS 7-9 IN SPRING AND FALL SEMESTERS COMPARED TO LEVELS 1-6

As mentioned above, in order to receive a promotion into the highest levels of the program (8-9) all students must take the 105 minute Exit Test. The results of this exam, together with the students' performance in writing during the semester, make up 30% of the total grade. In addition, speaking makes up 30% of the final grade. In order to be promoted, students must MEET the WRITING SLO.

The data show, perhaps predictably, that rate of promotion out of levels 7, 8 and 9 is lower than the promotion rates for levels 1-6 (where no such writing exam is taken) – although the sample size is relatively small at some levels (ex: 9)

a) Possible explanations

i) This may be partly explained by the nature of language learning. Progress at lower levels of proficiency tends to be faster, whereas once students reach high B2 through C2 level on the CEF-R (where our levels 7 through 9 are pegged) progress tends to be slower in general.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

ii) There is also the fact that in levels 1-6 there is no program wide exam which places checks on instructors promoting students. The fact that the promotion rate slows at level 7+ leads to possible concern that instructors are not attending enough to the writing SLOs, or teaching in an effective enough way to lead to promotion, and that this fact only comes to light through a final exam judged independently. In order to see if there was a difference between the promotion rates for students in sections headed by full-time lecturers, and those headed by adjunct instructors, promotion rates in fall and spring semesters were analyzed:

Semester	Intensive level leaders	Students NOT getting a level promotion	Percentage
Spring 2015	Full-time	7/28	25%
Spring 2015	Adjunct	20/44	45%
Fall 2015	Full-time	8/26	31%
Fall 2015	Adjunct	20/39	51%

While in some cases the lack of promotion could be attributed to individual students, there does appear to be a clear pattern that full-time instructors, who were part of the SLO creation and review process, and who are more familiar with SLO-based instruction, have better success in getting students promoted at levels 7-9.

In 2015, as part of the process of continuous improvement, a SLO revision project was begun. As of February 2016, Reading, Listening and Writing SLOs have been revised and implemented. Speaking is being revised in Spring 2016. The 2015 Annual Report projected that this would increase the amount of time spent on writing. In addition, an expanded set of norming activities for all faculty was also planned, with a view to better ensuring that day-to-day assessments were aligned with end-of-term assessments. Clearly not enough has been done in this area – full-time faculty appear to be better normed than adjuncts, and the data indicates that they are attending to the writing SLOs more successfully than adjunct faculty.

iii) As mentioned above, because students must meet WRITING SLOs in order to be promoted, it is conceivable that they MEET the other three skill areas (READING, LISTENING & SPEAKING) and yet do not receive a level promotion. In such instances, students may receive a passing grade of B-, despite the fact they need to repeat the level. This adjustment was introduced in Spring 2015 because it did not seem fair to give students a C grade when in all other skill areas apart from writing they made good progress.

If we analyze the PASS rates (B- or higher) at levels 7-9, then the data show a much healthier rate than that of promotion:

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

	Level 7				Level 8		
	Students	Pass	% Pass		Students	Pass	% Pass
Spring	41	31	76%	Spring	15	14	93%
Fall	49	41	84%	Fall	14	13	93%
2015 TOTAL	106	81	76%	2015 TOTAL	47	40	85%
	Level 9						
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass				
Spring	9	8	89%				
Fall	8	7	88%				
2015 TOTAL	20	18	90%				

This discrepancy between progression and pass rates gives us pause for thought, however.

b) Follow-up actions, planned and implemented

i) The data demonstrate that more guidelines and support would be beneficial for adjunct faculty (but potentially useful for all). In Spring 2016, a committee of full-time faculty, as part of their release time, is beginning work on creating a guide for faculty on 'teaching to the SLOs'. Such a guide will hopefully align instructors' content and assessment during the semester more accurately to the SLOs, so that when students take the Exit Test, the result meshes with work completed during the semester and serves to corroborate, rather than contradict, the students' actual progress.

ii) The program needs to expand its norming practices. As of now, all full-time faculty are normed at the beginning and end of each semester, prior to reading placement exams and final exit tests. No such norming, beyond familiarization with our Writing Guide, is currently provided for adjunct instructors.

iii) The program needs to look at SLO weighting at the upper levels (7-9) and also examine whether we want to continue judging a four-skills integrated course primarily on writing, or if we want to implement an additional exit speaking exam and use both to determine promotion. This review and discussion will begin in the spring semester, and continue in the fall. Because our levels are used as benchmarks for admission into YYY University graduate and undergraduate programs, changing the promotion process from a single writing exam to multiple skills has considerable ramifications for the program.

2. RATE OF PROMOTION OUT OF SUMMER XXP IS LOW IN LEVELS 7-9

At the end of the eight-week XXP course, students sit the same 105 minute Exit Test which students in levels 7-9 take at the end of the spring and fall semesters.

The data show that the promotion rate out of XXP is quite low, with the exception of the level 6/7 class, where 7/10 students promoted to level 7.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

a) Possible explanations

i) A typical promotion the program is one level over 14 weeks. It may just be that 8 weeks is not enough for students to make the required progress from one level to the next, even though there is a heavy writing focus in the course (but see point ii) below).

ii) The goal of the eight-week XXP course is to prepare students for graduate or undergraduate study in the US. Students work on academic skills, and spend a large amount of time working on writing a research paper. The Student Learning Outcomes for this course reflect its specialized nature. In effect, a level promotion is not the main aim – students do not work on improving their argumentative essay-writing skills, which the final Exit Test tests them on. Therefore, the lack of focus on this particular writing skill may explain the lack of promotion.

iii) Because promotion rests on the Exit Test, and the Student Learning Outcomes for XXP are based on different criteria, it is possible for students to PASS XXP and yet not receive a level promotion.

If we analyze the PASS rates (B- or higher) of XXP students, then, with one exception, the data show a much healthier rate than that of promotion:

	Level 6				Level 7		
	Students	Pass	% Pass		Students	Pass	% Pass
XXP	8	7	88%	XXP	14	7	50%
	Level 8				Level 9		
Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass	Pass rates	Students	Pass	% Pass
XXP	18	13	72%	XXP	2	2	100%

Level 7 obviously has a lower pass rate than 6, 8 and 9.

The fact that 12 students received a grade of C or lower (including three Fs) indicates that there were some students not taking the course seriously, or putting in the required work. 50% of grades below B- occurred in level 7, and four were in the same section.

iv) The level 7 section led by an adjunct instructor had only 1 student out of 8 promote to level 8. However, the level 7/8 section, and the level 8/9 section, both led by full-time instructors, had only 1 out of 10 and 7 out of 13 students promote respectively, so unlike in the fall and spring intensive program, there does not appear to be an observable difference between adjunct and full-time success rates.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

b) Follow-up actions, planned and implemented

We need to continue to look at the purpose of XXP. As it stands, it is not designed to move students towards a level promotion based on the current measure of the Exit Test – it is designed to prepare students for academic study in the US. The level promotion, while not guaranteed, is a ‘carrot’ for those students who plan on continuing at the XXP in the fall semester, so that they feel they are making progress through the levels, and so they don’t feel they are ‘repeating’ in the fall.

Budgetary approval for individualized tutorials (as proposed in the 2015 Annual Report) was not awarded, so for 2015 the structure of the course remained the same as in 2014. For 2016 and beyond, we need to explore additional options to address the promotion rate, and the discrepancy between the promotion and pass rate.

Possible initiatives to examine:

i) Offer a promotion based not on the Exit Exam, but on the specific learning outcomes of the XXP course. (This creates problems, because some students taking XXP are matriculated in the undergraduate School of YYY, which requires its international students’ language proficiency to be measured by the 105 minute Exit Test).

ii) Given the 8 week length, offer no option for promotion at all, and advertise the course as such, so that students know this is not the goal.

iii) For 2017, expand the course to the whole summer (11 or 12 weeks). This may be part of the program’s long-term strategic plan which is currently under review.

3. RATE OF PROMOTION FOR SUMMER A+B+C STUDENTS – FOR CONTIUNED MONITORING

While the overall pass rates for the individual summer sessions is healthy, the promotion rate for those students who have studied all 11 weeks and who take the end of session writing exam is lower at certain levels (5-7).

The sample size is small, however, so the data may not be wholly conclusive. The issue is complicated by the fact that not all students who are *eligible* for a level promotion choose to take the final writing exam (usually because they are not continuing their studies with us, so their final level is not so important to them).

Year	Eligible for promotion	# Tested	% Tested	# Promoted	% of those tested promoted
2014	66	32	48%	22	69%
2015	55	30	55%	18	60%

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

The promotion rates per level for eligible students who tested are as below:

		Level 1				Level 2		
	# SS	# Promo	% Promo	# SS	# Promo	% Promo		
Summer ABC 14	1	1	100%	2	2	100%		
Summer ABC 15								
		Level 3				Level 4		
	# SS	# Promo	% Promo	# SS	# Promo	% Promo		
Summer ABC 14	8	6	75%	7	6	86%		
Summer ABC 15	9	7	78%	4	3	75%		
		Level 5				Level 6		
	# SS	# Promo	% Promo	# SS	# Promo	% Promo		
Summer ABC 14	7	6	86%	4	1	25%		
Summer ABC 15	7	3	43%	7	2	29%		
		Level 7				Level 8		
	# SS	# Promo	% Promo	# SS	# Promo	% Promo		
Summer ABC 14	2	0	0%	1	1	100%		
Summer ABC 15	2	2	100%					
		Level 9						
	# SS	# Promo	% Promo					
Summer ABC 14	0	0	0%					
Summer ABC 15	1	1	100%					

a) Possible explanations

As mentioned, the sample size is obviously small, but the following reasons could be given.

- i) Summer ABC consists of three separate sessions, with students being taught by different teams of instructors in each session. The lack of continuity between these three sessions may not provide students with the optimal conditions with which to make enough progress to get promoted.
- ii) Summer ABC is only 11 weeks, three weeks shorter than a regular semester. 11 weeks simply may not be enough time for students to make the requisite progress, particularly when we get to the mid- to upper levels.
- iii) The Summer A level 5 instructors reported a number of students continuing from spring who seemed lower. These students had received a two level promotion from level 3. The fact level 5 students promoted at half the rate they did in 2014 might suggest the spring 2015 continuing level 3s were over-promoted.

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #2

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

iv) Summer C is taught by mostly adjunct instructors, some of whom are teaching in the program for the first time. The lack of familiarity with SLOs and standards may be a factor in overall quality.

b) Follow-up actions, planned and implemented

In Summer 2016, due to calendar issues, Summer ABC will be 12 not 11 weeks of study. We hope the extra week gives students more time to progress.

When creating Summer C intensive teaching teams, a conscious effort is made to pair new instructors with veteran / returning wherever possible in order to maintain quality.

The number not promoting may end up being statistically insignificant, but we will continue to monitor and explore different options for determining eligibility for promotion.

CEA Annual Review Sample