

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #7

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	4089	3250	-20.5%	<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	3	3	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	15	14	-6%	<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.**

While the overall number of student weeks decreased by more than 20% in 2015 (3250 in 2015 vs. 4089 in 2014), the number of student weeks for full-time enrollments remained almost the same. The number of student weeks for part-time enrollments, however, went down considerably (923 in 2015 vs. 1658 in 2014). The decrease is the result of removing our youth programs (which are now operated by a different company, as reported to CEA) so that these students no longer count toward our student week calculations.

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.

The year is divided into 8 or 12-week sessions divided in 2-week “blocks” during which time students are expected to master one level. Regardless of the length of a session, all SLOs for a specific level are being assessed through exams, tasks, quizzes, and homework. A “pass” constitutes an overall score of 80% across all areas of assessment.

The institution has rolling admissions. Historically, we collected only data per session, but this was deemed problematic because data for short-term students staying for just a few blocks was not being included. We now calculate pass/fail data per block so as to properly reflect the pass rates of all students in the program.

Additionally, we started collecting and analyzing the pass/fail data of students arriving late in a session and continuing to the end of that session. Late-arriving students have to make up all missed tasks and sit for the Comprehensive Exam at the end of the session. Their score on this exam is then used for all missed block exam scores when calculating their final grades.

STAFF COMMENT: The following files were provided with the report but are not included here:

- 2015 promotion rates by block
- 2015 promotion rates by session
- 2015 promotion rate for late arrivals

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.

(1) Effect of the standardized exams on promotion rates

In order to ensure that all SLOs were being assessed in a consistent, logical, and sequential manner from one session to another and from one teacher to another, we have standardized all our block exams, comprehensive exams, and oral and written tasks and started using them during the last three sessions of 2015. The table below lists our pass rates by level before and after standardization.

2015 Consolidated	Before Standardization	After Standardization
Basic 1	48.15%	34.21%
Basic 2	50.00%	45.74%
Intermediate 1	52.98%	65.58%
Intermediate 2	37.24%	45.27%
Advanced 1	47.52%	44.13%
Advanced 2	43.70%	65.14%
Elite 1	54.39%	52.73%

We will continue gathering data in 2016 to fully measure the impact of the new standardized testing tools.

(2) Our analysis of the pass/fail data in 2015 established that less than 50% of the students were promoted.

Our passing score is set to 80%. After comparing the score with other schools, we thought that perhaps this score was set too high. We conducted a study in 2015 to see what effect lowering the score to 75% would have on our promotion rate.

2015 Consolidated	80.00%			75.00%		
	Promoted	Retained	% per level	Promoted	Retained	% per level
Basic 1	65	103	38.69%	88	81	52.07%
Basic 2	130	146	47.10%	164	112	59.42%
Intermediate 1	221	145	60.38%	263	103	71.86%
Intermediate 2	183	256	41.69%	272	167	61.96%
Advanced 1	146	174	45.63%	199	121	62.19%
Advanced 2	130	114	53.28%	164	80	67.21%
Elite 1	60	52	53.57%	71	41	63.39%
TOTAL	935	990		1221	705	
PROMOTION RATE	48.57%	51.43%		63.40%	36.60%	

When the required pass score is lowered from 80% to 75%, the promotion rate increases from 48.5% to 63.4%, which we feel more accurately reflects the proportion of our students who are ready to progress to the next level. We have been conditionally promoting many students with scores ranging from 75% to 79% anyway, so we are now considering lowering the pass score to 75%.

(3) Late-arriving students

This was the first year when we tracked promotion rates for the students who start a session at a later date. To be considered for promotion, late arriving students have to attend at least 50% of any given session, make up all missed oral and written tasks, and sit for an additional comprehensive exam at the end of the session. Their score on this exam is then used for all missed block exam scores when calculating their final grades. Out of 59 students eligible for promotion, 42 (71.2%) were able to progress to the next level. The rate of promotion for these students is higher than our general pass rate of ~49%.