

# Index

## A

- Accountability, 2–7; accreditation and, 5–6; benchmarking and, 7; cost of attendance and, 6–7; expectations for learning and, 3–4; future trends in, 231–232; political environment and, 4–5; retention and, 4
- Accreditation, 5–6, 232
- Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), 232
- ACT. *See* American College Testing (ACT) Program
- Action steps, 179–181
- Admissions information, 28
- Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ), 257
- Adult Student Priorities Survey (ASPS), 259
- African American students, 25, 28–31, 40
- Agreement estimate, 125
- Alumni association case study, 213–226; background information, 213–215; database research, 216–219; qualitative study, 223–226; quantitative study, 219–223
- Alumni Outcomes Questionnaire, 220
- American College Personnel Association (ACPA), 269
- American College Testing (ACT) Program: Academic Advising Questionnaire, 202; Alumni Outcomes Questionnaire, 220, 229; Evaluation/Survey Services, 260; searching databases of, 28–29; Survey of Academic Advising, 172, 237, 265; Web site information, 229, 248
- American Council on Education (ACE), 114
- American Educational Research Association (AERA), 269
- American Evaluation Association (AEA), 207, 269
- American Imperative: Higher Expectations for Higher Education* report, 3
- Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), 148; factorial, 148; multivariate, 148–149
- Analysis of variance (ANOVA), 148; factorial, 148; multivariate, 148–149
- Assessment: accountability and, 2–7; codes of ethics for, 269; coordination of, 95–96; cost effectiveness, 14–15; ethical issues in, 191–209; examples related to student affairs, 17–18; existing databases used in, 23–47; future trends in, 231–246; getting started in, 9–11; measuring participation in, 11–12; mixed methodological approach to, 211–229, 241–242; needs, 12; organizational functions and, 8–9; outcomes, 13–14; planning for, 108–110; questions to consider for, 15–17; satisfaction, 13
- Association for Institutional Research (AIR), 50, 114, 269
- Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), 269
- Audit trail, 169
- Autonomy, 192–193
- Axial coding, 159

## B

- Backing up data, 142
- Basics of Item Response Theory, The* (Baker), 124

- Benchmarking, 7  
 Benefiting others, 194–196  
 Bias, sample, 87  
 Bivariate correlation, 145–146  
 Briefings, 183–188; delivering, 187–188;  
 materials for, 184–185; preparing for,  
 186–187  
 Buross Institute, 113–114, 115
- C**
- Canonical correlation, 147  
 Carnegie Foundation for the  
 Advancement of Teaching, 30, 50,  
 235–236, 248  
 Case studies: database research, 25–26;  
 mixed methodological approach,  
 213–228; usefulness of, 226  
 Casey, M. A., 68–69, 130–131, 132  
 Central tendency, 144  
 Checklists: for developing a sample,  
 102–103; for enhancing instrument  
 quality, 126; for informed consent,  
 200, 267–268  
 Chi-square test statistic, 155–156  
 Classification tools, 30  
 Cleaning data, 142  
 Closed-ended questions, 56  
 Cluster sampling, 86  
 Codes of ethics, 207, 269  
 Coding: qualitative data, 162–164;  
 quantitative data, 142–143  
 Coefficient of variation, 145  
 Collecting data. *See* Data collection  
 College Assessment of Academic  
 Proficiency (CAAP), 259  
 College Board database, 28–29  
 College Learning Assessment (CLA),  
 259  
 College Opportunities On-Line (COOL)  
 Data System, 30, 34, 50, 239  
*College Results Online* (The Education  
 Trust), 212  
 College Results Survey (CRS), 259  
 College Student Expectations  
 Questionnaire (CSXQ), 257  
 College Student Experiences  
 Questionnaire (CSEQ), 258  
 College Student Survey (CSS),  
 258  
 Colton, D., 55, 60–61, 117, 124  
 Commission of the Secretary of  
 Education, 2  
 Committee on Institutional  
 Cooperation, 237  
 Common Data Set (CDS) initiative, 44  
 Community College Student  
 Experiences Questionnaire  
 (CCSEQ), 258  
 Comparative data, 236–237  
 Compensation, participant, 64, 98–100  
 Compliance issues, 198  
 Comprehensive Alumni Assessment  
 Survey (CAAS), 259  
 Consumer Price Index, 6  
 Continuity correction, 263  
 Continuous variables, 144  
 Convenience sampling, 58, 85–86, 91  
 Convergent evidence, 124  
 COOL Data System, 30, 34, 50, 239  
 Cooper, R. M., 51, 107, 141  
 Cooperative Institutional Research  
 Program (CIRP), 37, 38–39, 257  
 Correlation: bivariate, 145–146;  
 canonical, 147; multiple, 146  
 Costs: assessing cost effectiveness, 14–15;  
 increasing for higher education, 6–7  
 Council for the Advancement of  
 Standards in Higher Education, 7  
 Course management systems, 45  
 Covariance, analysis of, 148–149  
 Covert, R. W., 55, 60–61, 117, 124  
 Crediting contributors, 204–205  
 Crime statistics, 33–34  
 Cross-tabulation analysis, 152–156;  
 descriptive statistics, 263–264; SPSS  
 computer syntax code, 261
- D**
- Dashboard indicators, 44–45  
 Data: accessing, 39–41, 202–203;  
 analyzing, 141–169; backing up, 142;  
 coding, 142–143; collecting, 51–74;  
 comparative, 236–237; organizing,  
 160–162; ownership, 203–204  
 Data analysis, 141–169; ANOVA and  
 ANCOVA in, 148; bivariate  
 correlation and regression in,  
 145–146; canonical correlation and  
 multivariate regression in, 147;  
 chi-square statistic in, 155–156;  
 coding process in, 142–143, 162–164;  
 cross-tabulation example of, 152–156;  
 descriptive statistics for, 144–145;  
 discriminant analysis in, 149–150;

- ensuring goodness in, 168–169; factor analysis in, 150–151; frequency tables in, 147; hierarchical linear modeling in, 151–152; interpreting data in, 167–168; levels of measurement in, 143–144; logistic regression in, 150; logit models in, 147; multiple correlation and regression in, 146; multivariate ANOVA/ANCOVA in, 148–149; organizing data for, 160–162; preparing data for, 142, 160; qualitative studies and, 158–169; quantitative studies and, 141–158; repeated measures in, 149; representing data in, 165–167; software packages for, 142, 156–158, 159; structural equation modeling in, 151; time series analysis in, 152
- Data collection, 51–74; database management and, 237–238; document review for, 73–74; field observations for, 70–73; focus groups for, 68–70; future trends in, 244; instruments for, 60; interviews for, 64–70; overview of, 51–52; surveys for, 52–64; time line for, 61–62; Web-based, 57, 62, 63
- Data exchanges, 236–237
- Data warehouses, 41
- Databases, 23–47; accessing, 39–41; building, 46; case study on using, 216–219; CDS initiative, 44; considerations for using, 24; external, 26–35, 36; future trends in using, 233–236; institutional, 233–234; internal, 35, 37–46; IPEDS system, 30–31, 33, 34, 35, 36; issues related to, 41–44; mixed methodological approach and, 213; relational, 41, 244; time required for managing, 237–238; training required to use, 42–43; typical data in, 44–46; Web resources on, 50
- Decision making, 238–239
- Degree-granting units, 232
- Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), 198–200
- Describing qualitative data, 165
- Descriptive statistics, 144–145
- Designing and Constructing Instruments for Social Research and Evaluation* (Colton & Covert), 117
- Dichotomous responses, 133
- Discrete variables, 144
- Discriminant analysis, 124, 149–150
- Dispersion, 144
- Do no harm principle, 193–194
- Document review, 73–74; advantages and disadvantages of, 74; protocol for conducting, 135–136
- Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project, 38
- Double-barreled questions, 118
- Dropouts, 4
- ### E
- Education Trust, The, 50, 212, 229
- Effectiveness, organizational, 9
- E-mail: for data backups, 142; for Web-based surveys, 62, 94
- Ending questions, 131
- Enrollment Information Service (EIS), 29
- Enrollment Planning Service (EPS), 29
- Enterprise systems, 41
- Ercikan, K., 241, 242
- Errors: checking reports for, 183; sampling, 86–87
- Esterberg, K. G., 66, 72, 132, 133, 160–161, 164, 167
- Ethical issues, 191–209; being faithful, 197–198; being just, 196; benefiting others, 194–196; codes of ethics, 207, 269; conceptual framework for, 192–198; crediting contributors, 204–205; data access, 202–203; data ownership, 203–204; doing no harm, 193–194; future trends in, 244–245; informed consent, 198–201, 267–268; obligations beyond, 205; respecting autonomy, 192–193; sources of assistance with, 206; Web resources related to, 208–209
- Evaluation/Survey Services (ACT), 260
- Evaluators: codes of ethics for, 269; guiding principles for, 207; skills upgrade for, 242–243
- Excel program, 142, 156, 255–256
- Executive summaries, 175–176
- Expedited review procedure, 200–201
- External data sources, 26–35, 36
- Extreme or deviant case sampling, 89–90

**F**

Face validity, 123  
 Faces of the Future survey, 258  
 Factor analysis, 123, 150–151  
 Factorial ANOVA/ANCOVA, 148  
 Faithfulness, 197–198  
 Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 43  
 Field observations, 70–73; considerations pertaining to, 71–72; dimensions of data collection in, 73; observer role in, 70–71; protocols for conducting, 134–135; writing notes about, 72–73  
 Filtering questions, 56  
 First-year assessment instruments, 114  
 Fisher's exact test, 264  
 Focus groups, 68–70, 87–93; case study using, 223–226; characteristics of, 68, 92–93; definition of, 88; number and size of, 68–69, 91–92; protocols for conducting, 129–132, 249–253; recruiting participants for, 70; sampling strategies for, 87–93; when to use, 69  
*Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research* (Krueger & Casey), 132  
 Focused coding, 164  
 Fontana, A. F., 65  
 Frequency tables, 147  
 Freshman Class Profile Service, 257  
 Freshman Survey, 38  
 Future trends, 231–246

**G**

Gansemmer-Topf, Ann M., 77  
 General questions, 133  
 Grinnell College, 97–98  
 Grob, G. F., 184–185  
 Grounded theory design, 159  
 Group interviews. *See* Focus groups  
*Guiding Principles for Evaluators* (AEA), 207

**H**

Handouts, 185  
 Health Insurance Portability  
 Accountability Act (HIPAA), 43  
 Hendricks, M., 184, 185, 187, 188

Hierarchical linear models (HLMs), 151–152  
 HLM software, 158  
 Honesty, 196  
 Human resources office, 206  
 Human subject scrutiny, 244–245

**I**

Incentives, participant, 64, 98–100  
 Individual interviews, 66–68  
 Informed consent, 198–201, 267–268  
 Institutional databases, 233–234  
 Institutional Review Board (IRB), 52, 192, 199–200  
 Instruments, 60, 107–138; challenges to using, 126–127, 136–138; development of, 109–110, 116–121, 126–127; list of commonly used, 257–260; locally designed, 112–113, 116–121; pilot testing, 60–61, 125; published, 111–112, 113–116, 127, 257–260; qualitative, 110–111, 127–138; quality determination for, 122–126; quantitative, 110–127; reliability of, 124–125; selection of, 109–110, 113–116; validity of, 122–124  
 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 30–31; crime statistics research, 34; finding existing data using, 212, 213; future trends in using, 235; information categories, 36; strengths and weaknesses, 35; student affairs expenditure research, 33; Web site information, 50, 229, 248  
 Intensity measures, 56  
 Intensity sampling, 89–90  
 Internal consistency estimate, 124  
 Internal data sources, 35, 37–46  
 Internet resources. *See* Web resources  
 Interpreting qualitative data, 167–168  
 Interval data, 143  
 Interviews, 64–70; focus group, 68–70, 87–93; guides for conducting, 132–134; individual, 66–68; semistructured, 66, 132; structured, 65; unstructured, 66  
 Introductory questions, 131  
*Involvement in Learning* report, 3  
 IPEDS. *See* Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

**J**

JMP software, 158  
Judicial affairs office, 206

**K**

Key questions, 131  
Kitchener, K. S., 192  
Kleinglass, N., 42  
*Knocking at the College Door* (WICHE),  
26  
Krueger, R. A., 68–69, 130–131, 132

**L**

LCD projectors, 186  
Learning: expectations for, 3–4;  
instruments for assessing, 259  
*Learning Reconsidered* report, 3  
Legal counsel, 206  
Likelihood ratio chi-square, 156, 263  
LIMDEP software, 158  
Locally designed instruments: challenges  
to using, 126–127; development of,  
116–121, 126–127; phrasing  
questions in, 117–119; published  
instruments vs., 111–113; response  
scales for, 119–121. *See also* Published  
instruments  
Logistic regression, 150  
Logit models, 147  
Log-linear models, 147  
Longitudinal studies, 97–98

**M**

Major Field Tests, 259  
Margin of error, 86–87  
Maximum variation sampling, 90  
Mean, 144  
Measure of Academic Proficiency and  
Progress (MAPP), 259  
Measurement: levels of, 143–144; of  
participation, 11–12  
*Measuring Quality: Choosing Among  
Surveys and Other Assessments of  
College Quality* (Borden & Zak  
Owens), 114, 115  
Median, 144  
Member checks, 169  
*Mental Measurements Yearbook, The*  
(Buros Institute), 113–114, 115  
Merriam, S. B., 191

Methods paragraph, 265  
Miami University, 238  
Microsoft Excel, 142, 156, 255–256  
Microsoft Word, 163–164  
Middle States Commission, 5–6  
Mixed methodological approach,  
211–229; case study, 213–228;  
database research, 216–219;  
explanatory overview, 211–213;  
future trends related to, 241–242;  
qualitative research, 223–226;  
quantitative research, 219–223  
Mode, 144  
Multiple linear correlation, 146  
Multivariate ANOVA/ANCOVA,  
148–149  
Multivariate regression, 147

**N**

National Center for Education Statistics  
(NCES), 27, 30, 235, 248  
National Commission on the Future of  
Higher Education, 231  
National Household Education Surveys  
(NHES), 99  
National Survey of Student Engagement  
(NSSE), 37–38, 96, 116, 237, 248,  
258  
Needs assessment, 12  
Nominal data, 143  
Nonprobability sampling, 58, 85–86  
Norman, W., 40  
North Dakota State University (NDSU),  
18  
Notes, field observation, 72–73  
NSSE. *See* National Survey of Student  
Engagement

**O**

Observations. *See* Field observations  
Off-campus services, 14  
Office of Institutional Research, 40,  
77  
Online course management systems,  
45  
Online surveys. *See* Web-based surveys  
Open coding, 159  
Open-ended questionnaires, 129  
Open-ended questions, 56  
Opening questions, 130–131  
Operations reports, 176

Oral reports, 183–188; briefing preparation, 186–187; materials preparation, 184–185; presentation delivery, 187–188. *See also* Written reports

*Orange Slice* reports, 182–183

Ordinal data, 143

Oregon State University, 18

Organizational functions, 8–9; organizational effectiveness and, 9; strategic planning and, 8–9

Outcome-oriented information, 54–55

Outcomes assessment, 13–14

## P

Paper-and-pencil surveys, 62, 63, 93–95

Participation, measuring, 11–12

Pascarella, E. T., 10

Pearson, Karl, 155

Pearson chi-square, 155–156

Peer Analysis System, 30–31

“Peer Ten” comparisons, 32–34

Peer-debriefing, 169

Pell Grants, 6

*Penn State Pulse*, 182, 239–240, 248

Penn State University, 17, 18, 182, 239–240, 248

Pilot tests, 60–61, 125

Planning: instrument selection and, 108–110; strategic, 8–9

Point of redundancy, 91

Policy Center on the First Year of College, 114, 115

Political pressure, 4–5

Population: definition of, 79; target, 81–83

Positionality, 137, 169

PowerPoint presentations, 184–185

Presentations, 183–188; delivering, 187–188; materials for, 184–185; preparing for, 186–187

*Princeton Review*, 239, 248

Privacy issues, 41, 42

Probability sampling, 58, 83–84

Process-oriented information, 54–55

Project DEEP, 238

Prokos, A. H., 65

*Proving and Improving: Strategies for Assessing the First College Year* (Swing), 114

PsychData software, 63

Psychological incentives, 99–100

Public records, 73–74

Published instruments: challenges to using, 127; identification of useful, 113–116; list of commonly used, 257–260; locally designed instruments vs., 111–113; resources for selecting, 115. *See also* Locally designed instruments

Purdue University, 45

Pure random sampling, 83–84

Purposive sampling, 58, 88

## Q

Qualitative data analysis, 158–169; coding process in, 162–164; describing data in, 165; ensuring goodness in, 168–169; interpreting data in, 167–168; listing assessment objectives in, 168; organizing and preparing data for, 160–162; overview of steps in, 159–160; reading through data in, 162; representing data in, 165–167. *See also* Quantitative data analysis

Qualitative instruments, 127–138; challenges to using, 136–138; document review protocols, 135–136; field observation protocols, 134–135; focus group protocols, 129–132; interview guides, 132–134; open-ended questionnaires, 129; reasons for using, 127–128; selection/development of, 110–111; time issues with, 137–138. *See also* Quantitative instruments

Qualitative studies: case example of, 223–226; data analysis for, 158–169; instruments for, 110–111, 127–138; quantitative studies combined with, 211–213, 241–242; sampling techniques for, 87–91

Qualitative variables, 144

Quality of instruments, 122–126; reliability and, 124–125; strategies for enhancing, 125–126; validity and, 122–124

- Quantitative data analysis, 141–158;  
coding process for, 142–143;  
cross-tabulation example of,  
152–156; forms appropriate for  
student affairs, 145–152; levels of  
measurement in, 143–144; simple  
descriptive statistics in, 144–145;  
software packages for, 142, 156–158.  
*See also* Qualitative data analysis
- Quantitative instruments, 110–127;  
challenges to using, 126–127;  
development of, 110–111, 116–121,  
126–127; locally designed, 112–113,  
116–121; published, 111–112,  
113–116; quality of, 122–126;  
selection of, 110–111, 113–116. *See also* Qualitative instruments
- Quantitative studies: case example of,  
219–223; data analysis for, 141–158;  
instruments for, 110–127; qualitative  
studies combined with, 211–213,  
241–242; sampling techniques for,  
83–86
- Quantitative variables, 144
- Questionnaires: data collection using,  
52–64; open-ended, 129. *See also*  
Surveys; *and specific questionnaires*
- Questions: categories of, 130–131;  
double-barreled, 118; general vs.  
specific, 133; open- vs. closed-ended,  
56; phrasing of, 117–119; scalar,  
120–121; sequencing of, 130;  
specific vs. general, 59–60; tips for  
generating, 133
- R**
- Random sampling: Excel used for,  
255–256; pure, 83–84; simple, 88–89;  
stratified, 85, 255–256
- Range, 144, 145
- Ratio data, 143
- Recommendations for change, 171, 179,  
180–181
- Referral sampling, 90
- Regression: logistic, 150; multiple linear  
correlation and, 146; multivariate,  
147; simple linear correlation and,  
145–146
- Relational databases, 41, 244
- Reliability, 124–125
- Repeated measures, 149
- Reports, 171–188; oral, 183–188;  
written, 173–183
- Representing qualitative data, 165–167
- Resident assistants (RAs), 193
- Respecting autonomy, 192–193
- Response rates: incentives/rewards and,  
98–100; paper vs. Web surveys and,  
93–95; survey fatigue and, 93–101;  
techniques for increasing, 100–101
- Response scales, 119–121
- Retention, 4, 107–108, 172
- Rewards, participant, 64, 98–100
- Rhatigan, J. J., 11
- Room and board costs: “Peer Ten”  
comparison of, 32; tuition and fees  
compared to, 6
- Roth, W.-R., 241, 242
- S**
- Sample bias, 87
- Sample size: for focus groups, 68–69; for  
individual interviews, 68; for surveys,  
57
- Sampling, 57–58, 79–93; checklist for,  
102–103; cluster, 86; convenience,  
58, 85–86, 91; definition of, 79; errors  
in, 86–87; extreme or deviant case,  
89–90; factors to consider in, 79–81;  
for focus groups, 87–93; intensity,  
89–90; maximum variation, 90;  
nonprobability, 58, 85–86;  
probability, 58, 83–84; purposive, 58,  
88; referral, 90; simple random,  
88–89; snowball, 58, 90; steps in  
process of, 81–83; stratified  
purposeful, 90; stratified random, 85,  
255–256; typical case, 89
- Sampling variance, 86–87
- SAS (Statistical Analysis System), 142,  
157
- Satisfaction assessment, 13
- Saturation point, 91
- Saunders, Kevin, 23, 107
- Scalar questions, 120–121
- Seidman, I., 67–68
- Selective coding, 159
- Semistructured interviews, 66, 132
- Shelley, Mack C., II, 141
- Simple linear correlation, 145–146
- Simple random sampling, 88–89
- Skills development, 242–243
- Slide presentations, 184–185

- “Small wins” concept, 10  
 Snowball sampling, 58, 90  
 Software: data analysis, 142, 156–158, 159; survey, 63, 244  
 Sonnichsen, R. C., 171, 179, 180  
 Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 6  
 Specific questions, 133  
 Spell check feature, 183  
 Spradley, J. P., 73  
 SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences), 156–157; computer syntax code, 161; data analysis using, 142  
 St. Olaf College, 97  
 Stability estimate, 124  
 Standard deviation, 144, 145  
 Stata software, 157  
 Statistical Analysis System (SAS), 142, 157  
 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. *See* SPSS  
 Strategic planning, 8–9  
 Stratified purposeful sampling, 90  
 Stratified random sampling, 85, 255–256  
 Structural equation models (SEMs), 151  
 Structured interviews, 65  
 Student affairs: accountability of, 232–233; assessment examples, 17–18; data analysis, 145–152; expenditures comparison, 32–33  
 Student Descriptive Questionnaire (SDQ), 257  
*Student Learning Imperative* report, 3  
 Student Outcomes Information Survey (SOIS), 260  
 Student proficiency assessments, 259  
 Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act (1990), 34  
 Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), 258  
*Student Success in College* (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, & Whitt), 38  
 Survey fatigue, 93–101; future trends and, 245–246; incentives/rewards and, 98–100; longitudinal studies and, 97–98; paper vs. Web surveys and, 93–95; suggestions for combating, 95–97  
 Survey Monkey software, 63, 244, 248  
 Survey of Academic Advising, 172, 237, 265  
 Survey Pro software, 244, 248  
 Surveys, 52–64; attitude and opinion, 56; case study using, 219–223; considerations for using, 54; identifying participants in, 56–57; implementation of, 62–63; instruments for, 60; multiple use, 59–60; paper-and-pencil, 62, 63, 93–95; participant incentives/rewards, 64, 98–100; pilot testing, 60–61; process- vs. outcome-oriented, 54–55; reasons for using, 53–54; response rates to, 93–101; sample size for, 57–58; sponsorship of, 100; time line for, 61–62; Web-based, 57, 62, 63, 93–95. *See also specific surveys*  
 Syracuse University, 18, 182
- ### T
- Target populations, 81–83; gathering lists of, 82–83; identifying, 81–82; selecting samples from, 83–86  
 Targeted reports, 176  
 Taylor, G. R., 211, 212  
 Technological tools, 244  
 Terenzini, P. T., 10  
 Test-retest reliability, 124  
*Tests in Print* (Buros Institute), 114  
 Three-way frequency tables, 147  
 Time issues: data collection and, 61–62; qualitative instruments and, 137–138  
 Time series analysis, 152  
 Transcribing process, 160  
 Transition questions, 131  
 Transparency, 239–240  
 Triangulation, 168  
 Trumbull, M., 211, 212  
 T-test, 148  
 Two-way frequency tables, 147, 152  
 Typical case method, 89
- ### U
- University of Kansas, 238  
 University of Massachusetts at Amherst, 18  
 Unstructured interviews, 66  
 Upcraft, Lee, 1  
*U.S. News and World Report*, 44

**V**

Validity, 122–124  
Variance, 144, 145; analysis of, 148–149;  
sampling, 86–87  
Volkwein, J. F., 44–45

**W**

Web resources: benchmarking standards,  
22; database resources, 50; ethical  
issues in assessment, 208–209;  
informed consent checklist, 200;  
published instruments, 114, 115;  
student assessment examples, 22;  
written reports, 182–183, 189  
Web-based surveys, 57, 62, 63,  
93–95  
Weick, Karl, 10

Western Interstate Commission for  
Higher Education (WICHE), 26  
“Why?” type questions, 133  
Wohlgemuth, Darin R., 23, 77  
Written reports, 173–183;  
acknowledging limitations of, 181;  
emphasizing findings in, 178; ensuring  
accuracy of, 183; graphics and tables  
used in, 181–182; methods paragraph,  
265; preparing multiple forms of,  
175–177; recommending action steps  
in, 179–181; samples of, 182–183,  
189; steps for preparing, 174;  
watching for land mines in, 177–178.  
*See also* Oral reports

**Y**

Your First College Year (YFCY) survey,  
258

