

# CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #5

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*	15246	7358	-51%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li><li>Please make sure that the number of student weeks matches the number on the sustaining fee form (for both years, if applicable).</li><li>To calculate the difference, subtract the number in column 2015 from the number in column 2014. Multiply the result by 100, then divide by the number in column 2014.</li></ul>
Full-time faculty	2	2	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li></ul>
Part-time faculty	47	22	-53%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Each faculty member should be counted only once even if teaching in a number of sessions.</li></ul>

**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.**

The percentage decrease in “student weeks” from 2014 to 2015 directly correlates with the percentage decrease in part-time faculty. Despite maintaining our institutional capacity for enrollments that meet and exceed the 2014 numbers, a number of external factors contributed to this decrease in “student weeks.”

External factors contributing to the decrease in “student weeks” from 2014 to 2015 include

- the changing global economic landscape, as the USD rose in value and the fall in oil prices, which affects oil industry-reliant economies of countries sending a sizable portion of students abroad to study English; increase in quantity and quality of regional English-language programs;
- changes in political leadership leading to decreased support of scholarship programs in countries sending significant numbers of students abroad to study English; and
- increased institutional support of IEPs on college and university campuses nationwide.

## CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #5

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

As our enrollments progressively decreased throughout 2015, faculty were informed of instructional opportunities through e-mail and in-person at monthly meetings. The corresponding decrease in part-time faculty occurred progressively, session by session, as teachers pursued other professional opportunities.

The institution underwent a change of ownership in the fall of 2015; with this transition, a number of changes occurred and are still underway. The changes appropriate for noting here are related to staffing, as a Student Services and Accommodations Coordinator and a Sales and Marketing Manager were hired at the end of 2015.

### **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.**

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

##### Background information on program structure and assessment:

Students are promoted to the next level of the program when they achieved a minimum of 70% in each grading component for the course. Grading components include a variety of weekly quizzes and assessments as well as on midterm and final exams.

Students in levels 2, 4, and 6 are given a comprehensive exam as the final weekly assessment of the course. These exams require them to understand and use vocabulary and language targets from the current and previous course. The score on the exam is averaged with the other weekly assessments in the course but the student needs earn a 70% on the comprehensive exam to pass into the next level.

# CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #5

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

## Pass Rates - Levels 1 to 8 - January 2015 through January 2016

Term 1: January 3 – March 6, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	13	92%
2	36	92%
3	23	96%
4	29	86%
5	19	95%
6	11	73%
7A	11	82%
7B	17	65%
8	8	38%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>80%</b>

Term 2: March 10 – May 1, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	20	100%
2	31	87%
3	21	71%
4	24	88%
5	18	94%
6	17	88%
7A	10	70%
7B	10	70%
8	6	67%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>82%</b>

Term 3: May 5 – June 26, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	14	57%
2	22	91%
3	29	69%
4	22	68%
5	15	80%
6	24	67%
7A	13	77%
7B	13	60%
8	7	100%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>74%</b>

Term 4: June 30 – August 21, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	9	78%
2	20	90%
3	21	81%
4	36	69%
5	16	88%
6	16	81%
7A	9	67%
7B	12	58%
8	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>77%</b>

Term 5: August 25, October 16, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	13	85%
2	14	100%
3	17	76%
4	25	76%
5	15	93%
6	14	71%
7A	10	60%
7B	15	53%
8	5	40%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>73%</b>

Term 6: October 20 – December 11, 2015		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	12	83%
2	12	75%
3	15	67%
4	23	65%
5	17	94%
6	14	93%
7A	11	27%
7B	12	58%
8	5	40%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>67%</b>

Term 7: December 15, 2015 – February 5, 2016		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	7	43%
2	12	83%
3	11	64%
4	22	64%
5	17	71%
6	13	62%
7A	12	58%
7B	13	62%
8	N/A	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>63%</b>

Cumulative 7 sessions 2014		
Level	# Students	Pass Rate
BASIC	N/A	N/A
1	88	77%
2	147	88%
3	137	75%
4	181	74%
5	117	88%
6	109	76%
7A	76	63%
7B	92	61%
8	31	57%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>978</b>	<b>73%</b>

## CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #5

Made available courtesy of CEA and with permission from accredited sites

**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.**

Six of the eight sessions of 2015 had average passing rates of 70% or above.

Students in our highest levels appeared to struggle the most to master learning outcomes, while the low- and mid-level courses have high pass rates. At the higher levels, our students needed to master a range of academic skills in order to demonstrate sufficient proficiency to move up to the next level. The combination of high-level production skills in rigorous academic tasks contributed to the lower pass rate than at low- and mid-levels.

In two isolated sessions, our Level 1 students struggled to master learning outcomes. We can identify a lack of literacy skills in English and a need for students to settle into their new cultural experience as contributing factors to the higher need to repeat a course.

Pass rates were lower in the last session of 2015, and we can attribute this to a high number of students only attending a portion of the session, as well as a higher volume of vacation requests that were made past the institutional deadline, causing missed work to count against their grade averages.

The institution of the following was effective in better serving our students in their pursuit of academic success, as evidenced by the higher passing averages:

- \* comprehensive exams at the end of Levels 2, 4, and 6 to identify students who have not sufficiently mastered the concepts and language targets of prior levels was effective;
- \* creation of a new scheme of assessment components which focused on production skills and knowledge of grammar and usage;
- \* restructuring of the New Student Orientation, which emphasizes the importance of academic responsibility through a PowerPoint presentation and with the explanation of the Student Handbook Handbook.
- \* In 2015, professional development workshops and trainings had a continued focus on assessment practices and the use of rubrics. As in 2014, we identified trends in the pass/fail rates of several faculty members and focused trainings and consultations on how to adopt different roles as a teacher, primarily how to distinguish the actions of assessing and facilitating.
- \* In the summer of 2015, a decision was made to switch to a different book series. The implementation of this new curriculum allows our institution to continue to serve our current students and help them meet their academic goals, as well as provide a pathway for new students to enter the program from our partner centers. A substantive change report detailing this transition has been submitted to CEA for review.