



May 1, 2014

James Ho
Washington Language Institute
5570 Sterrett Place, Suite 209
Columbia, MD 21044

Dear Mr. Ho:

The *CEA Policies and Procedures* require CEA to prepare a brief statement summarizing the reasons for the agency's denial of accreditation to a program or institution. The statement is forwarded to the site for comment. The statement along with the site's comment, if any, is forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education, the appropriate office at the Department of Homeland Security, licensing bodies and the public. If no response is made, CEA must provide evidence to the U.S. Department of Education that the site has been offered the opportunity to comment.

Following is the information that CEA will publish to the relevant parties, along with your response, if any. You may make general comments about the process and findings but should not respond to findings for each individual standard.

Washington Language Institute, 5570 Sterrett Place, Suite 209, Columbia, MD 21044, was denied accreditation by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation at its December 2013 meeting. The site appealed the decision. An independent CEA appeals board upheld the decision of the Commission to deny accreditation. The Commission accepted the report of the appeals board at its April 2014 meeting.

The following are the standards for which the school was found to be out of compliance and upon which the final denial was based.

Mission Standard 1
Curriculum Standard 1
Curriculum Standard 2
Curriculum Standard 3
Faculty Standard 1
Faculty Standard 2
Faculty Standard 5
Faculty Standard 7
Facilities, Equipment and Supplies Standard 1

Jame Ho
May 1, 2014
Page Two

Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 2
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 4
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 5
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 6
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 7
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 8
Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 9
Student Services Standard 1
Student Services Standard 2
Student Services Standard 4
Student Services Standard 5
Student Services Standard 6
Recruiting Standard 1
Recruiting Standard 2
Recruiting Standard 3
Length and Structure of Program of Study Standard 1
Length and Structure of Program of Study Standard 2
Student Achievement Standard 1
Student Achievement Standard 2
Student Achievement Standard 3
Student Achievement Standard 4
Program Development, Planning, and Review Standard 1
Program Development, Planning, and Review Standard 2

Upon request, CEA makes available to recognized accreditation and state approval agencies, as well as the Secretary of Education, information about the status of any program or institution.

We look forward to receiving your comments within 30 days. If you choose not to respond, this letter will be forwarded to the U.S. Department of Education showing evidence that you were given the opportunity.

Sincerely,



Teresa D. O'Donnell
Executive Director

**COMMENTS OF
COMMISSION ON ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM ACCREDITATION'S
DENIAL OF
ACCREDITATION FOR
WASHINGTON LANGUAGE INSTITUTE**

Washington Language Institute (WLI) respectfully submits its detailed self-study documents based on its right of described in the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) Policies and Procedures, March 2013.

WLI made tireless efforts in order to bring itself to full compliance with the CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions over the past years and was continuing its efforts to offer the best possible language training and instruction for our current and prospective students.

We recognize that there were areas in which WLI was not in full compliance as the Review Team Report and the Commission's Final Decision determined. WLI disagrees that the areas of deficiencies the Site Review Team and the Commission found were such that they could not be addressed satisfactorily within a one year.

WLI believes that the Commission based its decision on factual information that was substantially incorrect.

A. Conflict of Interest and Bias on the Review Team Report

WLI believes that one of the Site Reviewers, Ms. Brenda Robati, was the position of conflict of interest or at least had an appearance of conflict of interest that made it difficult or impracticable for her to stand in the position of a neutral reviewer. Therefore, it is highly likely that her review, evaluation, and input in the Review Team Report could have tainted the Review Team Report as a final product.

B. WLI Was Led to Believe that Its Curriculum Standards Were in Compliance

WLI's staff personally brought WLI curriculum to the CEA office in Alexandria, Virginia for the CEA staff to review WLI's curriculum. WLI sought CEA's advice and guidance as to whether its curriculum appear to meet the requisite standard, and whether there would be areas that WLI could improve, and how to make such improvements. CEA staff advised that the curriculum looked good, and advised WLI staff that the CEA will contact WLI if they find anything lacking,

so that WLI could make improvements if necessary. However, the CEA staff never contacted WLI after the meeting regarding the curriculum standards.

C. Misleading Feedback

WLI believed that what Review Team, Ms. Robati and Mr. Lilja was giving them an objective evaluation as everyone understood that the meeting was not a casual business meeting. WLI had sincere desires and still have the desires to meet the requisite Standards, and have made tireless efforts in preparation for accreditation to meet the requisite legislative mandate. Nonetheless, due to unpredictability of subjective determinations made outside the written CEA Standards, WLI was denied of its initial accreditation.

D. Lost Opportunity to Withdraw from Accreditation Process

- **Option to Withdraw from Accreditation Was Sent to a Wrong Email Address**
- **Option to Withdraw from Accreditation Was Sent to a Wrong Period time frame**

WLI timely learned of the option to withdraw, WLI would not have to wasted its financial and human resources to respond to the Review Team Report and on Appeal, or later reapply and go through the rigorous process of accreditation all over again if the Appeal is unsuccessful.

As described above, WLI made sincere and diligent efforts in order to bring itself to full compliance with the CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions over the past years and is continuing its efforts to offer the best possible language training and instruction for our current and prospective students.

As the Review Team Report and the Commission's Final Decision found, WLI recognizes that there are areas that WLI was not in full compliance. However, we respectfully **disagree** that the areas of deficiencies are such that they could not be addressed satisfactorily within a one-year period. We were committed to making unwavering efforts to bring WLI into compliance within a year.

As the result this has destroyed our livelihood and our ability to help and give the connections we made China and Korea opportunities to learn English and succeed in the USA.

We respectfully submit this comments document for the Board's consideration to remand the case back for the Commission's further consideration.

We thank you for your kind attention and considerations.

**Washington
Language
Institute**

SUBMITTED BY:

 05/19/2014
Signature Date

JAMES HO
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER
WASHINGTON LANGUAGE INSTITUTE
5570 STERRETT PLACE, SUITE 209
COLUMBIA, MD 21044
Email: hochapom@hotmail.com
Email: washlanginst@gmail.com
Tel: 410-730-3510 (WLI), 301-370-5033 (CEO)