

CEA Annual Review Sample Portfolio / SAMPLE #6

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	6936	9079	+31%	<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	10	9	-10%	<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	18	24	+33%	<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.)

The school saw a 30.9% increase in student weeks from 2014 to 2015. This difference is a result of the following:

- More resources were allocated to marketing which has resulted in an increase in the number of students from South America and Asia
- An increase in the number of students who participated in our XXX program as a result of adding weekend trips to a nearby metropolitan area
- We piloted a new YYY program which brought in additional students

As a result of this increase, more classes are being offered to ensure our class sizes are consistent. The number of students enrolled in each class has therefore only increased by 2 or 3 in some cases, but this increase is not a significant one. With the rise in the number of student weeks, more teachers were hired to ensure that we remain adequately staffed. We had 24 teachers on staff in 2015 which represents a 33% increase from 2014. Our facilities continue to be suitable to meet the needs of the number of students enrolled at any one time.

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.

PLEASE SEE P. 7 FOR INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THIS PART.

Our program offers thirteen sessions per year. Each session is four weeks long. Students are expected to complete two speaking assignments, a writing assignment, a midterm exam and a final exam. Students must score a minimum of 70% to successfully complete each level. Students who successfully complete each level and have met the learning outcomes is considered to have made satisfactory academic progress.

Attached documentation:

- * Pass/fail data by session
- * Achievement scores by session
- * Pass rates by level

PASS /FAIL DATA BY SESSION

Session	# of Students	# Passed	Incomplete	# Failed	2015 % Passed	Failure Rate	2014 % Passed	% Difference 2014-2015	% Difference 2013-2014	% Difference 2012-2013
Dec 29 - Jan 23	162	142	5	15	88%	12%	89%	-1%	13%	0%
Jan 26 - Feb 20	186	153	1	32	82%	18%	93%	-11%	30%	29%
Feb 23 - Mar 20	186	152	0	34	82%	18%	97%	-15%	25%	13%
Mar 23 - Apr 17	182	158	5	19	87%	13%	87%	-0.2%	30%	0%
Apr 27 - May 21	183	148	4	31	81%	19%	74%	7%	19%	26%
May 26 - Jun 18	198	152	1	45	77%	23%	75%	2%	52%	-33%
Jun 22 - Jul 16	154	62	62	30	40%	60%	71%	-31%	40%	-6%
Jul 20 - Aug 13	95	68	2	25	72%	28%	75%	-3%	17%	13%
Aug 17 - Sep 10	73	50	4	19	68%	32%	73%	-4%	7%	35%
Sep 14 - Oct 8	74	46	0	28	62%	38%	88%	-25%	24%	14%
Oct 13 - Nov 5	210	161	5	44	77%	23%	83%	-7%	-6%	27%
Nov 9 - Dec 4	196	162	12	22	83%	17%	89%	-6%	-5%	18%
Dec 7 - Jan 7	183	137	5	41	75%	25%	91%	-16%	-2%	60%
	2082	1591	106	385	75%	25%	83%	-8%	19%	15%

ACHIEVEMENT SCORES BY SESSION

* This sample represents all levels

Session	100 - 90%		89 - 80%		79 - 70%		69 - 21 %		20% - Incomplete		Total Students	
	IEP	# of Students	%	# of Students	%	# of Students	%	# of Students	%	# of Students	%	
Dec 29 - Jan 23		36	22%	63	39%	43	27%	15	9%	5	3%	162
Jan 26 - Feb 20		13	7%	66	35%	74	40%	32	17%	1	1%	186
Feb 23 - Mar 20		17	9%	85	46%	50	27%	33	18%	1	1%	186
Mar 23 - Apr 17		31	17%	73	40%	54	30%	18	10%	6	3%	182
Apr 27 - May 21		16	9%	47	26%	85	46%	31	17%	4	2%	183
May 26 - Jun 18		10	5%	63	32%	79	40%	43	22%	3	2%	198
Jun 22 - Jul 16		10	6%	24	16%	19	12%	51	33%	50	32%	154
Jul 20 - Aug 13		8	8%	35	37%	23	24%	26	27%	3	3%	95
Aug 17 - Sep 10		18	25%	16	22%	16	22%	18	25%	5	7%	73
Sep 14 - Oct 8		8	11%	17	23%	21	28%	24	32%	4	5%	74
Oct 13 - Nov 5		17	8%	69	33%	74	35%	43	20%	7	3%	210
Nov 9 - Dec 4		15	8%	75	38%	69	35%	28	14%	9	5%	196
Dec 7 - Jan 7		14	8%	67	37%	57	31%	40	22%	5	3%	183
Average		16.4	11%	53.8	33%	51.1	31%	30.9	21%	7.9	5%	
TOTAL		213		700		664		402		103		2082

PASS RATES BY LEVEL

Session	A1			A2			B1			B2			C1			C2			Private			TOTAL		
	# stu	# pass	%	# stu	# pass	%	# stu	# pass	%	# stu	# pass	%	# stu	# pass	%									
Dec 29 - Jan 23	18	12	51%	72	65	90%	43	37	86%	14	14	100%	9	9	100%	6	5	83%	0	0	0%	162	142	88%
Jan 26 - Feb 20	0	0	0%	77	67	87%	59	54	92%	32	19	59%	13	9	69%	4	3	75%	1	1	100%	186	153	82%
Feb 23 - Mar 20	0	0	0%	46	36	78%	86	67	78%	30	27	90%	0	0	0%	23	21	91%	1	1	100%	186	152	82%
Mar 23 - Apr 17	4	3	75%	52	44	85%	58	47	81%	45	42	93%	11	11	100%	11	11	100%	1	0	0%	182	158	87%
Apr 27 - May 21	5	1	20%	30	23	77%	65	46	71%	52	49	94%	0	0	0%	29	28	97%	2	1	50%	183	148	81%
May 26 - Jun 18	20	14	70%	25	11	44%	50	36	72%	64	61	95%	13	10	77%	24	18	75%	2	2	100%	198	152	77%
Jun 22 - Jul 16	10	5	50%	27	18	67%	31	13	42%	42	5	12%	13	10	77%	31	11	35%	0	0	0%	154	62	40%
Jul 20 - Aug 13	13	5	38%	47	40	85%	23	17	74%	3	2	67%	0	0	0%	9	4	44%	0	0	0%	95	68	72%
Aug 17 - Sep 10	7	3	43%	40	27	68%	19	14	74%	4	4	100%	0	0	0%	2	1	50%	1	1	100%	73	50	68%
Sep 14 - Oct 8	14	11	79%	31	15	48%	16	10	63%	10	8	80%	2	1	50%	0	0	0%	1	1	100%	74	46	62%
Oct 13 - Nov 5	33	24	73%	59	48	81%	48	33	69%	32	26	81%	13	9	69%	23	20	87%	2	1	50%	210	161	77%
Nov 9 - Dec 4	25	18	72%	49	43	88%	45	31	69%	23	21	91%	30	24	80%	22	21	95%	2	2	100%	196	162	83%
Dec 7 - Jan 7	15	8	53%	44	28	64%	53	39	74%	30	27	90%	23	20	87%	16	13	81%	2	2	100%	183	137	75%
	164	104	63%	599	465	78%	596	444	74%	381	305	80%	127	103	81%	200	156	78%	15	12	80%	2082	1591	75%

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.

From December 29th to June 18th, the pass fail rate was fairly consistent. The rate fluctuated between 81% and 87%. In the May 26th session, the rate fell to 77%. This was a result of students losing focus. A large part of our student body is made up of students sent from our partner university in XXX. These students study with us for eight months while they prepare to take an English proficiency exam facilitated by our institution, at the beginning of summer. The May 26th session was the last full session of classes for these students and the success rate fell from 81% to 77% as their focus shifted to preparing for the English proficiency exam. The drastic fall from 77% to 40% in the June 22nd session was a result of these students returning home half way through the session which severely affected the pass rate.

Starting July 20th the speaking assessments were reduced from three to two. This was as a result of ongoing assessment reviews which revealed that group presentations were being dominated by the stronger students. As a result, weaker students did not contribute much but received higher grades assigned for group work. By removing group presentations and focusing on individual presentations students are able to focus on the learning outcomes and on language use. More time is now allocated to doing research and developing confidence using English in front of large groups. As a result, there has been a slight decrease in the number of passes but this decrease reflects a more accurate scoring and has yielded better results in terms of meeting learning outcomes and improved speaking in general. The pass fail rate fluctuated between 72% and 77% between the July 20th and the October 13th sessions, but increased to 83% in the November 9th session as a result of more students taking advantage of our one-on-one tutoring.

In the December 7th session, the rate fell to 75% and this is due to students losing focus in anticipation of the Christmas and New Year holiday. Some students returned home over the holidays and this also affected the pass rate as they missed classes while they were out of the country.

Student attendance and academic performance are constantly being monitored by both the Admissions team and the Academic Director.