

CERTIFICATE OF ACCREDITATION

This certificate acknowledges that

**International Center for English
at Arkansas State University**

is in compliance with the

CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions

and is accredited by

the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation

for the period August 2013 through August 2017.


Nancy Storer
Chair 2013


Teresa D. O'Donnell
Executive Director

Commission on English Language Program Accreditation
801 North Fairfax St., Suite 402(A), Alexandria VA 22314



Leading by Advancing Standards

August 3, 2013

Dr. Magdi Kandil
International Center for English at Arkansas State University
2108 Aggie Road, Room 309
Jonesboro, AR 72401

Dear Dr. Magdi Kandil:

At its **August 2013** meeting, the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation reviewed the one-year accreditation of the **International Center for English at Arkansas State University**. Based on your response to the provisions of your one-year accreditation, I am pleased to inform you that the Commission has granted 4- years continued accreditation to the program. The enclosed Certificate of Accreditation signifies the program's achievement.

In reviewing a program or institution, the Commission seeks to determine that the mission and educational objectives are being communicated and met; that performance with respect to student achievement is being realized; that the program or institution is organized so that its mission and educational objectives are supported by adequate human and fiscal resources; and that there is evidence of sufficient financial stability; and that the *CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions* are being met. In addition, for a review of one-year accreditation, the Commission thoroughly evaluates the response to the provisions of the one-year accreditation. The Commission has determined that your program is in compliance with all standards, and that there are no requirements for future reporting.

Public Announcement

Within 30 days following the decision by the Commission, CEA will make the accreditation status public through distribution to various professional groups. CEA lists accredited programs and institutions on its website with a link to the site's website.

You are receiving the CEA logo in several formats, along with guidelines for its use *in print and electronic materials*. CEA encourages you to display your accredited status on your web site and in promotional materials as a way to not only promote your program, but also to promote CEA accreditation and the quality it exemplifies. You may also announce your accredited status in promotional or informational literature using the following wording:

*The International Center for English at Arkansas State University is accredited by the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation for the period **August 2013 through August 2017** and agrees to uphold the CEA Standards for English Language Programs and Institutions. CEA is recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education as a national accrediting agency for English language programs and institutions in the U.S. For further information about this accreditation, please contact CEA, 801 North Fairfax Street, Suite 402A, Alexandria, VA 22314, 703.665-3400, www.cea-accredit.org.*

We hope that you will take advantage of this opportunity to display your achievement of accreditation.

CEA will keep complete records of the review in a secure place and will make public only the type of accreditation granted. Information provided by the program and related to the accreditation review is considered the property of the program.

Constituent Council

A CEA accredited program or institution becomes a member of the CEA Constituent Council. (Constituent Council Governing Rules on enclosed CD.) The annual meeting of the Constituent Council takes place at the NAFSA conference at a time to be announced. As a member of the Council, you have a number of obligations to CEA:

- to maintain the *CEA Standards* (Available on the CEA website and on the enclosed CD)
- to adhere to CEA policies and procedures as stated in the *CEA Policies and Procedures* (Available on the CEA web site)
- to post the *CEA Standards* in a public place, along with the document "Filing a Complaint Against an Accredited Program," (Copies on enclosed CD.) Please make these two documents publicly available to allow others to review the standards that the program meets and to provide an opportunity for input should there be any questions about whether the program continues to meet the standards.
- to submit an annual report each year of accreditation
- to report any proposed substantive changes. (Note that substantive changes, as detailed on the Substantive Change form found on the CD, must be reported in advance.)

Annual Reports and Fees

Annual reports and sustaining fees are due at the beginning of each calendar year of accredited status. You have paid fees for the current year so no additional fees are required at this time.

Accreditation is an intensive process of self-evaluation and review. Congratulations on your achievement.

Please contact Terry O'Donnell at the CEA National Office if you have questions.

Sincerely,



Nancy Storer, Chair 2013

Enclosures on CD flash drive: *CEA Standards*, Filing a Complaint against an Accredited Program, Constituent Council Governing Rules, and Substantive Change Report



Commission on English Language Program Accreditation

Commission Action Report

Program or institution: International Center for English, Arkansas State University

Date of action: August 2013

Action taken: Granted 4-year continued accreditation with two (2) reporting requirements

Date of next review: August 2014

The Commission has found the program or institution not to be in full compliance with the individual *CEA Standards* noted below. Non-compliance means that the program or institution does not have all of the essentials in place to meet the specified standard. The program or institution must respond to the reporting requirement(s) listed below at least two months prior to the date of next review. (See above)

Reporting Requirements by standard:

Faculty Standard 1: Faculty members have education and training commensurate with their teaching assignments.

August 2012 Commission Concern described in the Commission Action Report:

At the time of the visit, three instructors out of 16 lacked the MA in TESOL and had been told by the Director to complete their degrees in order to remain employed by TICE.

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 1: Document that the steps being taken to ensure that all faculty meet hiring requirements are continued. Provide evidence that faculty have the qualifications for teaching in an academic program, as required by this standard. (Faculty 1)

June 2013 TICE Response:

At this time, only two instructors without an MA TESOL degree are employed by TICE. Both are currently enrolled in an MA TESOL program, with projected completion dates of August 2013 and May 2015. Transcripts have been submitted as evidence. In addition, TICE job postings now require an MA in TESOL or a closely related field for all future hires.

Reporting Requirement 1 appears to be met. No further reporting is required.

Program Development, Planning, and Review Standard 2: The program or language institution regularly reviews and revises its program components and has a plan, in writing, to guide the review of curricular elements, student assessment practices, and student services policies and activities. The plan is systematically implemented. (= Curriculum Standard 4, Student Achievement Standard 5, and Student Services Standard 9 in the 2010 version of the Standards)

August 2012 Commission Concern described in the Commission Action Report:

While the program had a plan in writing for all three of the required program components (curriculum, assessment, and student services), there was no evidence of implementation.

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 2: Submit a copy of the plan for review and revision of curriculum. Provide documentary evidence that the plan is being fully implemented. (C4)

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 3: Submit a copy of the plan for review and revision of assessment and reporting practices. Provide documentary evidence that the plan is being fully implemented. (SA 5)

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 4: Submit a copy of the plan for review and revision of student services and activities. Provide documentary evidence that the plan is being fully implemented. (SS 9)

June 2013 TICE Response:

TICE submitted a copy of its biannual curriculum review plan and included extensive documentation as evidence that every step has been completed. Extensive student needs analysis has been performed, student learning outcomes evaluated and modified, instructional materials updated, methodologies reviewed based on the results of classroom observations and student surveys, student achievement analyzed and changes proposed.

TICE also submitted a copy of its assessment review plan and evidence of its implementation, including student satisfaction surveys, pass/fail and placement data analysis, meeting minutes and new standardized rubrics for speaking and writing courses.

While TICE has not provided a copy of its student services review plan, it submitted completed student satisfaction surveys with questions on the pre-arrival process, orientation and handbook, insurance, academic/personal/immigration advising, and activities. The body of the response included a discussion of the survey results and a few steps that have been/can be taken as a result such as exploring different insurance options or re-instating the position of events coordinator. The original student services review plan included with the self-study called for review meetings to be held in August as well as at the start of each term (September, January, and June), for decisions to be made based on new international student regulations and feedback from students, faculty, and staff, and for minutes to be distributed within 24 hours after each meeting. While there is evidence that student satisfaction with student services has been surveyed, there is no evidence that it has been reviewed in the manner stipulated by the review plan.

August 2013 Follow-up Reporting Requirement 1: By June 1, 2014, submit a copy of the plan for review and revision of student services and activities that includes all areas required by the standard. Provide documentary evidence that the plan is being systematically implemented. (PDPR 2)

Program Development, Planning, and Review Standard 1: The program or language institution has a plan, in writing, for development of the program or language institution, including planning, implementation, and evaluation. (=Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 9 in the 2010 version of the Standards).

August 2012 Commission Concern described in the Commission Action Report:

There is as yet no indication of implementation of the program review plan submitted with the response to the Review Team Report.

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 5: Submit a copy of the TICE Program Development Review Plan and provide evidence that it is being fully implemented. (AFC 9)

June 2013 TICE Response:

TICE submitted extensive documentation of ongoing and regular review of its mission and goals, facilities, internal and external factors that affect student enrollment and curriculum development, administrative procedures and policies, budget, as well as a planned review of the program's development plan. The documentation included evidence of needs analysis, surveys and survey analysis, meeting minutes, and reports. Steps taken / changes made as a result of the plan's implementation were discussed as well.

Reporting Requirement 5 appears to be met. No further reporting is required.

Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 3: Administrators and staff receive written job descriptions at the time of employment and any time their duties and terms of employment change. (Formerly AFC 6)

Administrative and Fiscal Capacity Standard 5: The program or institution describes to administrative and support staff clearly and in writing the performance criteria and procedures for evaluation at the onset of the evaluation period; conducts administrative and support staff performance evaluations that are systematic, regular, fair objective, and relevant to achieving programs goals; and conveys evaluation results to administrative and support staff in writing in a timely manner. (Formerly AFC 8)

August 2012 Commission Concern described in the Commission Action Report:

At the time of the visit, there was no job description available for the director, as required by AFC 6. Also, there were no written performance criteria or procedures for the evaluation of the director, as required by AFC 8.

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 6: Submit a copy of the job description and the performance criteria and procedures for evaluation of the Director of TICE, showing that the procedure meets the intent of the standard. In addition, document that the evaluation has been carried out for the current Director based on the performance criteria and following the stated procedures. (AFC 6 and AFC 8)

June 2013 TICE Response:

TICE submitted a job description for the Director that includes responsibilities and qualifications. It also provided a description of the evaluation process that includes a form completed by faculty once a year and an evaluation by the supervisor that incorporates the results of the faculty evaluation as well as the

job description's list of specific responsibilities and involves a face to face meeting and a written follow-up. TICE submitted a copy of the faculty evaluation form as well as a letter from the program director's supervisor as evidence of performance evaluation.

It is not obvious that the attached supervisor's evaluation incorporated the results of faculty evaluations, and no results of faculty evaluations were included. It is also not clear how the new evaluation procedure and performance criteria have been communicated to the director in writing prior to the start of the evaluation period. Since the evaluation process/timeline are not stated in the job description, and no updated version of the administrative/faculty handbook was provided, it cannot be verified that the institution describes to the director clearly and in writing the performance criteria and procedures for evaluation at the onset of the evaluation period nor that the evaluation process is regular and systematic.

August 2013 Follow-up Reporting Requirement 2: By June 1, 2014, provide evidence that performance evaluation procedure and criteria are communicated to the director in writing at the onset of the evaluation period and that performance evaluation for the director is regular, systematic, and follows the stated procedures. (AFC 4, AFC 5)

Student Services Standard 3: The program or institution provides pre-arrival and ongoing orientation to support students in their adjustment to the program or institution (and to the host institution if applicable), and to the surrounding culture and community, and to promote their understanding of DHS regulations and procedures and health and safety issues.

Student Services Standard 7: The program or institution clearly states and fulfills its responsibilities regarding student housing.

August 2012 Commission Concern described in the Commission Action Report:

At the time of the visit, some students appeared not to understand various student services that are provided due to the shared provision of student services with the Office of International Programs, including separate orientation sessions, both of which students must attend. Confusion appeared specifically in the area of student housing in which pre-arrival information and information provided upon arrival were contradictory.

August 2012 Initial Reporting Requirement 7: Submit evidence that all informational materials provided to TICE students correctly inform them about available services, including housing requirements. (SS3, SS7)

June 2013 TICE Response:

TICE stated that all pre-arrival and orientation materials have been updated and checked for consistency; TICE also submitted copies of the International Family Packet, New Student Welcome Information, and Exchange Visitors Welcome Information packets. The packets indicate housing regulations, stating that ESL students are required to live on campus and must submit a housing application and a deposit; a link for the application is included in the materials. The packets also specify that students are responsible for their own housing arrangements if arriving after hours, on weekends, or without a confirmed housing assignment.

TICE stated that a new software system fsaATLAS has been implemented in order to improve the efficiency of pre-arrival communication with students, and that the new student orientation schedule

has also been extended to two days, with students getting help with housing on the first day. No supporting documentation for the orientation sessions has been provided; however, the revised pre-arrival materials, compared to those submitted at the time of initial accreditation, are much clearer and more detailed with respect to housing and transportation arrangements, so it is reasonable to assume that they now include all of the information that used to be presented to students only after their arrival.

Reporting Requirement 7 appears to be met. No further reporting is required.

Format for reporting

Submit your report according to the Format for the Response to Reporting Requirements, a copy of which is on the enclosed CD.

Please review the reporting requirements listed above and submit a notice to Terry O'Donnell at the CEA office within 30 days, showing your intent to comply by the date of next review.

Future review by the Commission

Your response to the reporting requirements listed in this Commission Action Report will be reviewed by the Commission, which may grant 4-year continued accreditation. If the site remains out of full compliance with any standard, the Commission may withdraw accreditation unless it is judged that the program is making a good-faith effort to come into full compliance. In such case, accreditation may be continued for 4-years, with future reporting required as determined by the Commission.