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CELI exams:

- Administered since 1987
- Addressed to general public
- 6 levels tested from A1 to C2 (CELI 5) of the CEFR
- 5 levels audited (A2-C2)
CELI exams and ALTE Audits

- 2007: 1° ALTE Audit on CELI exams (CELI 3 – B2)
- 2011: ALTE Audit on CELI 1, CELI 2, CELI 4, CELI 5
- 2013: ALTE Audit on CELI 3
- 2017: ALTE Audit on CELI 1-5
2013 ALTE Audit: Resolved with Recommendations For Improvement (among others):

- MS 16: COMMUNICATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS (lack of systematic collection of feedback from test takers and examiners)

- Before 2017 Audit actions were taken to compensate
Questionnaires (P.B.) to candidates and examiners: broad structure 1

• Candidates:
  1. Personal info
  2. Reasons for taking the exam
  3. Info on written part
  4. Info on oral part
  5. Comments
CELI EXAMS
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2019
DATA REPORT
Some figures:

• 630 CANDIDATES;
• 27 EXAMINATION CENTRES;
• 20 COUNTRIES;
• 4 CONTINENTS.
Centres selected

IIC Kiev, CIC Mosca, IIC Cracovia, ECAP Basilea, CPSI Losanna, IIC Colonia, Universidad de Malaga, Instituto de Idiomas Siviglia, Universitat de Valencia, IIC Budapest, IIC Atene, IIC Parigi, IIC Lione, IIC Strasburgo, IIC Tirana, IIC Tokyo, IIC Istanbul, IIC Tel Aviv, Centro Italiano Yaounde, IIC Tunisi, IIC Buenos Aires, IIC Città del Messico, IIC San Paolo, BTS Chong Quing, Comunità S.Egidio Roma, Padova Unica Terra, CPIA Cuneo.
Distribution on exams

- 34 CELI1 (A2) candidates;
- 217 CELI2 (B1) candidates;
- 221 CELI3 (B2) candidates;
- 84 CELI4 (C1) candidates;
- 41 CELI5 (C2) candidates.
Characteristics of the population

**AGE**

- 12-17: 69
- 18-25: 231
- 26-35: 140
- 36-45: 107
- 46-55: 62
- 55+: 18
- No answer: 3
Characteristics of the population 2

EDUCATION

- <5: 9%
- 10-14: 30%
- 14+: 42%
- 5-9: 14%
- no answer: 4%
Characteristics of the population

Reasons for taking the exam

- Self satisfaction: 25%
- Study: 20%
- CV: 15%
- Work: 10%
- Culture: 10%
- Course: 5%
- Law: 5%
PERCEPTION OF THE EXAM
In my view, time allowed for the written part was...

too much/ enough /too little
Time (written part)

- Celi 1: 85% Too much, 6% Enough time, 9% Too little
- Celi 2: 87% Too much, 6% Enough time, 6% Too little
- Celi 3: 67% Too much, 21% Enough time, 7% Too little
- Celi 4: 66% Too much, 31% Enough time, 2% Too little
- Celi 5: 66% Too much, 29% Enough time, 5% Too little
In my view, the written part of the exam was...

Easy  Difficult
Difficulty (written part)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>celi 1</th>
<th>celi 2</th>
<th>celi 3</th>
<th>celi 4</th>
<th>celi 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Easy
- Med.
- Difficult
WRITTEN PART

Do you think one of the tasks was especially difficult?

• 127 comments (20% of test-takers involved)

Wide and dissimilar answers

It turns out to be difficult to single out one task only per level considered to be especially difficult in the eyes of test-takers; no relevant tendency emerged, showing how subjectivity plays a fundamental role in the perception of a «difficult» task.

Criticality mostly mentioned: time, listening
Do you think one of the tasks was especially difficult?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Especially difficult task</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CELI 1</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELI 2</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELI 3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELI 4</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELI 5</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clarity and completeness of task rubrics

Rubrics in the exam paper were clear/complete...

little  →  much

1  2  3  4

Results not shown here, resulted in changes on rubrics, particularly on lower levels
Other questions regarded oral exams, their perception, and how motivating they appeared
Questionnaires (P.B.) to candidates and examiners:

broad structure 2

- Examiners:
  1. Personal info
  2. Info on examiner’s activity
  3. Comments
• 2011 ALTE Audit: Resolved with Recommendations For Improvement (among others):

• MS 12: RELIABILITY OF RESULTS - SPEAKING PART

• Before 2017 Audit actions were taken to compensate
SPEAKING PART – ACTIONS UNDERTAKEN

- Training of examiners (introduction of a section in our site);
- Creation and dissemination of a “Vademecum for CELI examiners – speaking part”
- Revision of “Criteria for assessment”
EXAMINERS’ VIEWS

• **Training of examiners** (clarity, completeness, usefulness, adequacy, professional enrichment): average values **from 3.8 to 3.4**;

• **Vademecum** (clarity, completeness, sharing info, standardization of assessment): average values **from 3.7 to 3.5**;

• **Criteria for assessment** (clarity, completeness, sharing info, standardization of assessment): average values **from 3.6 to 3.5**;

• **General opinion**: commitment required (3.1), professional growth (3.6), stress derived (1.7).
CONCLUSIONS

- Positive impact of ALTE Audits on CELI exams quality
- Investigate further criticalities arisen
- Systematic collection of info (via different media)
- Possible revision of exams also on the basis of collected info
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