

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #4

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	9,840	7,752	-21%	<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	11	9	-18%	<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	76	61	-23%	<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.)

Our student numbers have dropped 21% mainly due to the strength of the dollar and weakness of currencies of countries from which our students emanate. Aside from the world economy, the ever-growing cost of living in XXX has also had a deleterious effect as students have had to grapple with both the strong dollar and the high cost of housing and basic expenses. Our student feedback has been consistently excellent and we are convinced that the economy is the primary explanation for our drop in numbers. Our quality, facilities, and class averages have not changed.

Our full-time faculty members are down due to our drop in student numbers. Our part-time faculty is down 23% due to having fewer students and thus fewer classes, but also because we needed fewer teachers during what are typically seasonal bursts that did not occur in 2015.

We would like to inform the CEA that our teachers elected to form a union in June 2015 and we have recently agreed on a collective bargaining agreement. The main issues concerned compensation and the cost of living in XXX.

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.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Students can be admitted to our program at any time throughout the year. In order to track student progress, our school has several assessments in place: a placement test, level tests between each level, and exit tests. We also have bi-weekly progress tests and one-to-one feedback sessions in class. While these results influence a student's progression through levels, they are not as definitive as the passing of a level test, which is directly aligned with the all of the student outcomes for a level.

We begin with a universal placement test with grammar and vocabulary, as well as writing or speaking evaluations. The questions on the grammar and vocabulary section are carefully mapped to the CEFR, and with this score as well as their productive skills analysis, the students are placed in a level. We often have several classes for some levels operating simultaneously, and might be at different places along the path of the curriculum. Each two week period is considered a separate unit, with its own learning outcomes and accompanying assessment (biweekly test and one-to-one feedback on progress). Essentially, regardless of the student's length of stay, they can achieve learning outcomes and track their progress.

Once a student is ready for a level test (at any time after four weeks of study) or an exit test upon leaving, in addition to the universal component explained above, each level has its own reading, writing, and listening assessment. A student must have at least 70% in the reading and listening sections, as well as have reached the next level in the universal assessment component in order to progress to the next level.

For students who stay in the program for at least four weeks, we collect the following data in order to measure progression and the reaching of learning outcomes (attached):

1) *International Semester Course (ISC) student tracking.* This document tracks our long term students (6 months or longer) through their course. We track their original level, how long they are in each level, and their final levels.

2) *Value Added Score tracking.* This document tracks students with courses of four weeks or more who took the exit test upon completion of their course. The scoring system takes their placement test score and their exit test score into account, as well as their length of stay. The result is a number that we call their "Value Added Score." Essentially, we can see how much progression a student makes for their number of weeks of study. This can be used to compare averages over time, and fields such as whether a longer-term or shorter term student makes more progress per week of study. There are documents for each quarter of 2015.

3) *Pass/Fail rates for level and exit tests.* We collect and store all data from level and exit test scores in this document. However, it should be noted that we allow our students to progress at their own rate and to take the level test when they think they are ready. This results in some failing scores of students who may not have been realistically prepared for a level progression. The fail rate is therefore higher than it would be if every student were sufficiently prepared.

4) *Cambridge exam course pass/fail rates.* Here we collect information about how many students pass the Cambridge exam at the end of their course. This informs us of the efficacy of our Cambridge placement test, which determines if students are level appropriate for the course, and then their progress in the course itself.

BASIC DATA RESULTS

Starting level: Consistent with the last 4 years, the majority of students begin in our level 3 (CEFR A2).
A1: 22% ; A2: 38% ; B1: 31% ; B2: 3% ; C1: >1%

End level: Just as in 2011-2014, the majority of our students finished in B2.

Progression in levels through the program:

Two levels: 12%

Three levels: 53%

Four levels: 35%

All students progressed through at least two levels in 24 weeks.

Length of time at each level as students progress:

On average, students spend 8-10 weeks in a level.

Average time in first level attended: 8 weeks

Average time in second level attended: 10.9 weeks (up from 10 last year)

Average time in third level attended: 9 weeks

Average time in fourth level attended: 6 weeks (many students leave before completing the fourth level of their stay)

Value Added Scores: These are the averages for students studying 4 to 36 weeks.

Q1 2014 1.29

Q2 2014 1.60

Q3 2014 1.83

Q4 2015 1.51

Q1 2015 1.36

Q2 2015 1.37

Q3 2015 1.78

Q4 2015 1.54

Cambridge exam course pass rates

FCE: 61/80 (76.25) for both 2014 and 2015

2014: 25/35 (71.42%)

2015: 36/45 (80%)

CAE: 88/105 (83.8%) for both 2014 and 2015

2014: 48/56 (85.7%)

2015: 40/49 (81.6%)

CPE: 34/35 (97.1%) for both 2014 and 2015

2014: 21/22 (95.5%)

2015: 13/13 (100%)

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.

At it has been over the last five years, level 3 (CEFR A2) is the most common first level; our students spend between 8 and 10 weeks in each level and progress through three levels during their stay, usually exiting at level 5 (B2).

In 2013 we began tracking with Value Added Scores, which compare placement and exit test scores for students who spend at least four weeks in the program. This tracks whether students are making progress, regardless of whether they stay long enough to change levels. The scores have been fairly consistent over the last three years, proving that every student who spent four weeks or more in the program has made progress. Again, if one analyzes the progress *per week*, a shorter term student actually makes more progress than a student here 24-36 weeks. This can be explained by big leaps of progress during the beginning of a student's stay, when their passive knowledge is activated. What's more, some longer term students have slumps especially around the "intermediate plateau" level.

Our Cambridge exam pass rates are 80-100% over the three levels this year, consistent with last year for CAE and CPE, but up 8% in FCE. This indicates that the Cambridge placement test is accurate and only students who have a good chance of making the necessary progress are admitted into the course. What's more, passing the Cambridge exam also indicates that these students are excelling in achieving learning outcomes for this course and are achieving their personal goals as well.