



**2021 Standards Review Committee
Summary of Public Comments and Impact Statement
November 2021**

The Standards Review Committee has reviewed public comments regarding the proposed standards revision and proposed restructuring of the Discussion sections of the *CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions*. Survey responses were solicited from the Constituent Council, current CEA reviewers, site visit representatives, and individuals in the field through solicitation from membership organizations such as EnglishUSA, UCIEP, the NAFSA IEP network and the TESOL IEP network and the Program Administration, Higher Education and Adult Education interest sections. The following is a short summary of the survey results and a statement of the impact of the survey on the proposed revisions.

Demographics:

There were 117 responses to the survey, representing engagement from the field and the Constituent Council. The profile of respondents reflects a high level of CEA knowledge and provided especially valuable feedback.

- Of the respondents, 55% (n=64) work at CEA-accredited sites. Of these, 70% (n=49) represented sites with programmatic accreditation and 23% hold institutional accreditation (n=16) with 6% (n=4) holding general (international) accreditation.
- 46% (n=50) of all respondents were administrators, 21% (n=23) were faculty, 16% (n=17) were faculty with administrative duties, 3% were staff (n=4), and others represented former directors, researchers, retirees, and graduate students or teaching assistants.
- 50% (n=44) identified as self-study coordinators and 72% (n=63) were CEA reviewers with the remaining divided among CEA Representatives (10%, n=9), current or former Commissioners (16%, n=14) and other (14%, n=12) comprised of primary contacts, self-study contributors, and independent consultants.

Proposed Standards Changes:

Length and Structure of Program of Study 2

95% (n=104) of respondents who answered this item (n=108) considered the proposed revisions to be satisfactory or excellent. 99% (n=109) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the proposed revision to the standard expressed important and valid principles of good practice within the field (out of n=110 responses to this question).

41% (n=44) respondents commented with feedback for the Standards Review Committee on the proposed revision to the top-level standard. Many were positive, indicating that the revised language of the standard for Length and Structure of Program of Study Standard 2 clarified the meaning and intent of the standard. Some comments expressed concern about changes to meaning of the standard, or a more prescriptive approach to this standard, and suggested wording changes. No additional revisions are proposed as a result of public comments.

Proposed Restructuring Changes:

92% (n=108) of respondents answered questions regarding the presentation of information in the proposed restructuring on the Discussion section.

- 96% (n=104) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the presentation of information in the restructured Discussion section results in increased clarity.
- 94% (n=101) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that having a subsection labeled “Intent” increases clarity.
- 83% (n=97) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that having a subsection labeled “Discussion” increases clarity. 9% of respondents chose neither agree nor disagree.
- 96% (n=102) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that having a subsection labeled “Requirements” increases clarity.

Specific feedback was solicited regarding proposed language added to the restructured “Requirements” section: [Evidence of data analysis and actions taken to remedy unanticipated patterns of progression can consist of reports, review timelines, meeting minutes, curricular revisions, or other documentation.](#) 99% (n=116) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the proposed additional language is helpful.

Additional Comments

A final section soliciting comments for the Standards Review Committee had 31 comments. Many were positive, thanking the SRC for its work and for the opportunity to comment on the proposed revisions to the *CEA Standards for Language Programs and Institutions*, and recommendations to adopt the restructured discussion format in other standards. A limited number of comments expressed concerns about specific word choices, applicability of revisions to programs with mixed-level or rolling enrollment structures, or comments about standards other than Length and Structure of Program of Study Standard 2. These comments will be considered in future reviews by the Standards Review Committee.

As part of ongoing standards review, feedback is solicited from all programs and language institutions at the time of the submission of the self-study report, and from reviewers and CEA Site Visit Representatives at the time of each site visit.

Please contact Heidi Vellenga, Staff Liaison to the Standards Review Committee at hvellenga@cea-accredit.org with any questions about the standards, this survey, or the public comment impact statement.