


INDEX


Page references followed by *fig* indicate an illustrated figure; followed by *t* indicate a table; followed by *e* indicate an exhibit.

- Academic majors assessment:
e-portfolios for proficiency-based, 95–99; integrating student/program assessment with teacher candidate portfolio, 100–104; issues to consider for, 89–91; review and feedback process for improving plans for, 104–108; scientific research skills of physics majors, 91–95
- Academic majors profiles: Alverno College, 100–104; Miami University, 91–95; Moravian College, 104–108; University of Akron, 95–99
- Academic Profile (now MAPP), 56, 76, 77–78, 85–87
- Accreditation: Colorado State University's learning assessment after, 269; curriculum mapping workshops identifying need for improvement, 15; medical education, 249; student portfolios used for external review of, 23; University of Central Florida's assessment program and successful, 12
- Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education, 249
- ACE-FIPSE project: assessing international learning by, 175, 176, 188–193; Student Portfolio and Information Form (SPIF) used by, 189–191, 192–193. *See also* American Association of Colleges and Universities
- Administration, assessment implementation leadership by, 11–12
- Agnes Scott College, building an assessment culture at, 8–9
- Alcohol policy violators (Truman State University), 213–217
- Alexiou, J. J., 22
- Aloi, S. L., 14
- Alverno College: Department of Educational Research and Evaluation (ERE) of, 101–103; ED 420 portfolio assessment, 101; electronic portfolios used at, 23–24; teacher candidate portfolio used for assessment at, 100–104; undergraduate academic majors assessment at, 90
- American Association of Colleges and Universities, 144, 188–193. *See also* ACE-FIPSE project
- American Board of Internal Medicine Foundation, 248, 249
- American College Personnel Association, 214
- American Philosophical Association's Delphi Report (1990), 63
- Angelo, T., A., 165
- Anstendig, L., 130, 140
- Ardemagni, E., 55
- Armocost, R. L., 12
- Artz, P., 137
- Ash, S., 55, 58, 59
- Assessment: connecting program review and, 152–172; creating evidence-based culture of, 8–9; evaluating the process of, 16–18, 27–28; needs, 15; SJSU's multicomponent process of building culture of, 254–255. *See also* Assessment good practices; Institution assessment profiles
- Assessment Advisory Council (AAC) [Illinois State University], 150


- Assessment Committee (College of Wooster), 24–25
- Assessment culture: creating evidence-based, 8–9; SJSU's multicomponent process of building, 254–255
- Assessment findings: American Council on Education's application of, 191–192; Bellevue University's application of, 138–140; Binghamton University's application of, 146–148; BYU's use of, 36–37, 154–157; California State University, Sacramento's application of, 203–205; Colorado State University's application of, 271–273; communicating and using, 18–19; Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC) application of, 231–233; CSBSJU's application of, 163–164; DePaul University's application of, 257–258; ensuring use of, 25–27; FAMU's application of, 85–87; Ferris State University's application of, 123–124; Hocking College's application of, 260–262; Illinois State University's application of, 160–161; Iona College's application of, 263–264; IU-Bloomington's applications of, 171–172; KSU application of, 51–53; MDC use of, 43–45; Medgar Evers College's application of, 133–136; Miami University's application of, 92–95; Moravian College's application of, 106–108; NCSU application of, 59–61; NEIU's application of, 77–78; North Carolina State University's application of, 182–183; OSU's application for, 81–82; Pace University's application of, 142–144; Pennsylvania State University's application of, 207–209; providing credible evidence of learning in, 21–24; reviewing assessment reports of, 24–25; St. Louis Community College (SLCC) application of, 223–225; St. Mary's College's application of, 178–179; San Diego State University's application of, 238–239; San Jose State University's application of, 276–277; Texas Christian University's application of, 116–117; Thompkins Cortland Community College's application of, 226–229; Truman State University's application of, 215–216; Tufts University's application of, 186–188; UA use of, 39–40; University of Akron's application of, 97–99; University of Alabama's application of, 194–196; University of Hawaii at Manoa's application of, 211–213; University of Maryland's application of, 168–169; University of Northern Iowa's application of, 113–114; USF's application of, 64–65; USMA application of, 48–49; Walden University's application of, 241–242; Widener University's application of, 126–128; William Paterson University's application of, 72–74
- Assessment good practices: educating faculty and staff about, 14–16; evaluating the assessment process, 16–18, 27–28; in improving and sustaining assessment, 253–277; linking student learning outcomes to, 31–33; putting students at center of student expected learning outcomes, 33–38. *See also* Assessment
- Assessment implementation: assessing processes as well as outcomes, 16–18; educating faculty and staff on good assessment practices, 14–16; empowering faculty and staff roles in, 12–13; providing leadership for, 11–12; providing sufficient resources, 13–14
- Assessment instruments: Academic Profile (now MAPP), 56, 76, 77–78, 85–87; based on information literacy competence standards, 56; CLAQWA (Cognitive Level and Quality of Writing Assessment) rubric, 56, 63–64, 65; College Adjustment Scales (CAS), 132; College Student Experiences Questionnaire, 17; Current Practices Inventory, 26; DEAL (Description, Examination, and Articulation of Learning) model, 55, 58, 60–61; electronic portfolios, 23–24; factors to consider when measuring student learning, 22–23; Faculty Assessment Scoring Team (FAST), 85; Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, 160; Hansen Proficiencies, 96; Inquiry, Discover, Interpret, and Develop (I DID), 219, 222; KPIs (Key Performance Indicators), 4, 254, 262–268*t*; LAASIE plan, 219, 222, 223, 224; learning-centeredness rubric, 118, 119*t*–122*t*; Miami University's Scientific Inquiry Rubric, 92; PRF (professional rating form), 249–252; Program Review for Academic Assessment plan (PRAAP) rubric, 159, 160–162; Retention Alert System, 133; sample learning literacies rubric, 70*e*–72*e*; Standards of Critical Thinking rubric, 55, 59, 61; Student Information System Integration, 133; Tompkins Cortland Community College use of, 225–229; TrueOutcomes Assessment Manager, 132–133. *See also* Portfolios; Surveys
- Assessment Peer Consulting Program (St. Cloud State University), 13
- Assessment planning practices: assurance of learning initiative for academic degree programs, 50–54; building an assessment culture based on evidence, 8–9; components of an effective written plan, 7; connecting assessment to institutional goals/processes, 4–5; creating a written plan using a matrix, 5–6*t*; engaging stakeholders, 3–4; good practices in implementing, 31–54; of multicampus/multidisciplinary general education assessment, 40–45; review and feedback process for improving, 104–108; student affairs, 38–40; timing the assessment, 7–8; triangulation of data sources on learning outcomes, 46–49
- Assessment planning profiles: Brigham Young University (BYU), 31, 33–38; Kennesaw State University (KSU), 50–54; Miami Dade College (MDC), 40–45; United States Military Academy




- (USMA), 46–49; University of Alabama's student affairs, 38–40
- Assessment reports: description and collection of, 24; Iona College's Mission KPI Report, 264e–265e; reviewing, 24–25; San Jose State University (SJSU), 275; University of Hawaii at Manoa's OSA Student Assessment Report, 212
- Association of American College and Universities (AACU), 173
- Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), 56, 69
- Attitudes: of BYU unit leaders toward review process, 156; community service impact on student, 174; Ferris University's rubric measuring course syllabi, 123; as learning outcome type, 191; measuring civic, 175, 184, 185, 186; measuring community, 186; OSU's rubric measuring student, 81; PLE (project-led education), 18; PRF (professionalism rating form) measuring, 248–252
- Augustine, H. C., 13
- Awards: Award for Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes (2008), 32; Bellwether Award for High Impact Course-Level Assessment, 233; CCCB's Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes, 233; CHEA Award for Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes, 54
- Bain, K., 165
- Banta, T. W., 1, 11, 16, 24, 27
- Barlow, L., 8
- Bashford, J., 32, 40
- Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, 160
- Bellevue University: moving to a Web-based system of assessment, 137; technology use profile, 137–140; WEAVEonline system adopted by, 130, 138, 140
- Bellwether Award for High Impact Course-Level Assessment, 233
- Benchmarking, 152
- Bender, K. K., 254, 268
- Binghamton University (State University of New York), online survey for assessment at, 130–131, 144–148
- Blake, L. P., 8
- Bloom's Taxonomy: Bellevue University's curriculum mapping based on, 139; CLAQWA rubric based on Educational Objectives-Cognitive Domain of, 63–64; “create new knowledge” proficiency category of, 97; DEAL model based on, 55, 58; Hansen Proficiencies similarities to categories in, 96
- Blue, J., 89, 91
- Borden, V.M.H., 151, 169
- Bowers, P., 56, 79
- Boyer, E. L., 184
- Boyer Partnership Assessment Project, 168, 182
- Bresciani, M. J., 8, 236, 237
- Bridges, B. K., 174
- Brigham Young University (BYU): assessment findings application at, 36–37; assessment planning profile of, 31, 33–38; campuswide Wiki site, 31, 33; description of review process at, 150; five most commonly cited strengths and challenges, 155t, 156t; LearningOutcomes.BYU.edu assessment role at, 34, 35, 37; Mission Statement (1981) of, 154; ongoing systematic assessment at, 152–157; program review profile of, 151–157; putting students at center of learning outcomes assessment, 33–38; University Academic Unit Review Committee (UARC) of, 152, 153, 154; University Educational Support Review Committee (UESRC) of, 152, 153, 154
- Brill, R. T., 90, 104
- Brown, S. W., 173
- Buckley, J. A., 174
- Building a Scholarship of Assessment* (Banta & Associates), 1
- Burlingame, P., 200, 205
- Busby, A. K., 32, 38
- Bush Foundation, 14
- Business colleges: faculty serving as assessment leaders, 13; JWU's MBA capstone projects, 243–248; professional development at, 16, 236, 243, 244, 247
- California State University, Dominguez Hills: formal review of assessment reports at, 25; University Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee at, 25
- California State University, Sacramento: creating/implementing student affairs assessment at, 201–205; evaluating the assessment process at, 27; SMART objectives used at, 202; student affairs centered on student learning, 199
- Cameron, J. A., 220, 225
- Capstone courses: JWU's Graduate School evaluation of authored, 236, 243–248; Tompkins Courtland Community College, 219–220; Wooster's Senior Independent Study as, 25. *See also* Curriculum
- Caracelli, V. J., 187
- Career services assessment, 205–209
- Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 99
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 168
- Castillon, V., 27, 199, 201
- CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) software, 206–207
- CCBC Guide to Learning Outcomes Assessment and Classroom Learning assessment*, 231
- Center for Teaching Excellence, 72
- Cermak, K. A., 253, 255
- CHEA Award for Institutional Progress in Student Learning Outcomes, 54
- Checkoway, B., 184
- Ciliberti, A., 56, 66
- CIRP Freshman Survey, 76
- Civic engagement assessment: enhancing student resource use during the first year, 180–184; improving student engagement through, 176–180; issues to consider for, 173–176; mixed-method approach to, 184–188
- Civic engagement assessment profiles: North Carolina State University, 180–184; St. Mary's College, 176–180; Tufts University, 184–188
- CLAQWA (Cognitive Level and Quality of Writing Assessment) rubric, 56, 63–64, 65
- CLASSE (Classroom Survey of Student Engagement), 175, 193–197




- Classroom engagement assessment, 175, 193–197
- Clayton, P. H., 55, 58, 59
- Click, B., 18, 174, 176
- Cognitive peer coaching, 16
- College Adjustment Scales (CAS), 132
- College Alcohol Study (Wechsler et al.), 214
- College Park Scholars (University of Maryland): best assessment practices of, 165*t*; description of, 165; new assessment plan created by, 151, 164–169
- College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University (CSBSJU): integrating assessment, program review, and disciplinary reports at, 162–164; online reporting system created at, 150–151; program review profile of, 162–164
- College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), 17, 200, 210–211
- College of Wooster: Assessment Committee's Guidelines for Assessment used at, 24–25; Senior Independent Study experience at, 25
- Colorado State University (CSU): PRISM system at, 269, 270, 271, 272; program review integrated with assessment at, 254, 268–273
- Communicating assessment findings, 18–19
- Communication skills: assessing learning literacies and, 66–67; DePaul University's assessment of, 253–254, 255–258; FAMU's assessment to improve, 84–88; Johnson & Wales University Graduate School assessment of, 236, 243–248; Northeastern Illinois University assessment to improve, 75–79; OSU institutional portfolio to assess, 80–83; Pace University's multifaceted portfolio for assessing, 140–144; St. Mary's College's assessment to improve, 176–180; USF assessment to improve, 62–66. *See also* Proficiency-based assessment
- Community college assessment: GREAT (general education assessment teams) project, 229–233; improving student learning using mission-based, 220–225; issues to consider for, 219–220; living rubrics for reflection, deliberation, and revision, 225–229
- Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC): *CCBC Guide to Learning Outcomes Assessment and Classroom Learning assessment*, 231; CGAs (common graded assignments) used at, 220, 231, 233; GREAT project used at, 229–233
- Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), 44
- Community colleges assessment profiles: Community College of Baltimore County, 220, 229–233; St. Louis Community College, 219, 220–225; Thompsons Cortland Community College, 219–220, 225–229
- Community service: impact on student attitudes by, 174; NCSU's First Year College (FYC), 17, 174, 180–184; Tufts University civic learning through, 184–188
- Computer science skills, 95
- Conference on College Composition and Communication, 144
- Connors, R., 63
- Core curriculum: St. Mary's College assessment used to improve, 18, 176–180; Texas Christian University's, 115, 117, 118; Western Heritage, 177. *See also* General education assessment
- Core Curriculum Implementation Committee (St. Mary's College), 18, 177
- Cosgrove, J. J., 219, 220
- Coughlin, L., 18, 176
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), 54, 233
- Course syllabi: determining learner-centeredness of, 118–125; reflective portfolio used to improve, 238–239; rubric for assessing, 118, 119*t*–122*t*
- CPAAS (TC Civic and Political Activities and Attitudes Survey), 185–188
- Cressman, J., 253, 255
- Critical thinking skills: assessing learning literacies including, 66–75; CLAQWA rubric inclusion of, 63–64; DEAL model used to assess, 55; description of, 67*e*–368; FAMU's assessment to improve, 84–88; NCSU course assessment on, 58–62; USF assessment to improve, 62–66; William Paterson University assessment of, 66–75. *See also* Learning literacies
- Crossman, J. M., 16, 236, 243
- Cruise, M., 25
- Cullen, R., 110, 118
- CUNY entrance exams, 132, 133, 135
- Current Practices Inventory, 26
- Curriculum: DACUM process for developing, 223, 259, 260; reflective learning portfolio used to reform, 236, 237–243; St. Mary's College assessment used to improve, 18, 176–180; Texas Christian University's, 115, 117, 118; Western Heritage, 177. *See also* Capstone courses; First year courses
- Curriculum mapping: Bellevue University approach to, 139; "From Assessment to Action: Back-Mapping to the Future" workshop on, 111–112; institutional web site resources on, 114; University of Northern Iowa use of, 15, 111–114
- Curtis-Tweed, P., 27
- Cutright, M., 173
- DACUM curriculum development: Hocking College use of, 259, 260; St. Louis Community College use of, 223
- DEAL (Description, Examination, and Articulation of Learning) model, 55, 58, 60–61
- DePaul University: Liberal Studies Council (LSP) assessment role at, 253–254, 255–256; Liberal Studies Program (LSP) at, 256–258; peer review used at, 253, 256–258
- Diamond, R. M., 22
- Dickinson College, 189
- Diller, K. R., 23
- Disciplinary reports-program review approach, 162–164
- Disseminating assessment findings, 18–19
- Distance education assessment, 144–148
- Dolinsky, B., 27
- Dowhower, A., 200, 205
- Dwyer, C. A., 22




- Eames, A. L., 75
- Educational Testing Service (ETS), 85
- Einarson, M. K., 13
- Elder, L., 55, 59, 61
- Electronic portfolios: Alverno College use of, 23–24; American Council on Education and Consortium of Colleges and Universities use of, 188–197; description of, 23; Pace University use of, 130; Pace University's use of multifaceted, 140–144; University of Akron use of, 95–99. *See also* Technology-enabled assessment
- Employers: as assessment stakeholder, 22; gathering assessment evidence through, 46, 47, 90, 111; Hocking College's assessment input from, 254; PRISM reports provided on internships to, 272; student e-portfolios open to, 97, 142. *See also* Stakeholders
- Engineering education: using assessment to refine, 26, 34; CLAQWA adaptation to assessing, 65; inclusion of ethics in, 26; learning goals connected to, 5; PLE (project-led education) approach to, 17–18; U.S. Military Academy learning goals on, 46, 49. *See also* Technology competence
- Ethics: Hocking College's Success Skills including, 259; Iona College's Mission KPI Report on, 265e, 267; teaching value of, 26, 84, 85, 265e, 267; Virginia Tech's engineering education inclusion of, 26
- Evenbeck, S. E., 27
- Faculty: Binghamton University's online survey of, 130–131, 144–148; BYU's assessment engagement by, 35, 37; empowering assessment leadership roles to, 12–13; engaged in assessing learning literacies, 68fg–72; engaging in assessment, 3; providing credible evidence of student learning, 21–24; review and feedback process for improving assessment by, 104–108; reviewing assessment reports, 24–25; Title III funding received by St. Norbert College, 14; USMA assessment role of, 48; Walden University's problem “anonymous reviewer,” 240. *See also* Incentives; Leadership; Stakeholders
- Faculty Assessment Scoring Team (FAST), 85
- Faculty development: back-mapping approach to, 111–114; cognitive peer coaching approach to, 16; empowering assessment leadership roles through, 12–13; providing good assessment practices education, 14–16; providing sufficient resources for, 13–14
- Faculty development profiles: Ferris State University, 118–125; Texas Christian University, 114–118; University of Northern Iowa, 111–114; Widener University, 125–128
- Faculty learning communities (FLCs): description and benefits of, 15; Texas Christian University, 15, 109–110, 114–118
- Faculty ownership: FAMU assessment approach facilitating, 84–88; impact on general education assessment by, 84–87
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, 160
- Feedback: Group Instructional Feedback Techniques (GIFTs), 16; Moravian College's feedback and review process, 104–108; Walden University's problem faculty “anonymous reviewer,” 240. *See also* Peer review
- Ferris, S. P., 56, 66
- Ferris State University: assessing course syllabi to determine learner-centeredness, 118–125; learning-centered qualities rubric used at, 110
- Feyl, S. B., 130, 140
- Findings. *See* Assessment findings
- First Year College Student Experiences Survey (SES) [NCSU], 17, 174
- First year courses: Medgar Evers College's Freshman Seminar, 133, 135–136; North Carolina State University's First Year College (FYC) course, 17, 174, 180–184; Northeastern Illinois University, 56, 75; St. Mary's College's First Year Experience, 178–179; William Paterson University's First Year Seminar, 72. *See also* Curriculum
- First year experiences: CIRP Freshman Survey on, 76; NEWS (Networked Early-Warning System) for student retention during, 131–136; North Carolina State University survey of, 17, 174, 180–184; OU's comprehensive study of, 26–27; student learning value of, 173. *See also* Students
- First-year assessment profiles: North Carolina State University, 180–184; St. Mary's College, 176–180
- Fish, D., 144
- Flateby, T., 56, 62, 63
- Flattau, P. E., 235
- Florida A&M University, linking assessment findings to planning/budgeting at, 19
- Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU): examining general education assessment approach at, 57; faculty ownership influencing general education assessment at, 84–88
- Florida Board of Governors (FBOG), 84
- Focus groups: BYU's dissemination of assessment through, 37; CLASSE follow-up by, 196; College Park Scholars use of, 165; FAMU's assessment use of, 85; First Year College (FYC) incorporation of, 183; as indirect assessment measure, 57; Pace University's use of, 4; on SLCC transfer student experience, 224; UAO's support of departments through meaningful, 160; USMA assessment using, 47; USMA's assessment through student, 22; Virginia Tech's use of, 26. *See also* Interviews
- Ford, T., 24
- Friend, C., 63
- Fuller, M. B., 150, 157
- Fulton, C., 14
- Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), 189
- Galey, W. R., 249
- General education assessment: of critical thinking and higher-order reasoning in courses, 58–62; using direct and indirect evidence in,




- 75–79; examining different institutional approaches to, 55–57; faculty ownership impact on, 84–87; Great (General Education Assessment Teams) Project [CCBC], 229–233; improving students' writing and thinking through, 62–66; institutional portfolio used in, 79–83; KSU's Assurance of Learning (AOL) initiative on, 50–54; of learning literacies, 66–75; MDC's multicampus/multidisciplinary process for, 40–45. *See also* Core curriculum
- General education assessment profiles: Community College of Baltimore County, 229–233; Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU), 84–88; North Carolina State University (NCSU), 55, 58–62; Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU), 75–79; Oklahoma State University (OSU), 79–83; University of South Florida (USF), 62–66; William Paterson University, 66–75
- General Education Institutional Portfolio (FAMU), 84–87
- Gibson-Ballah, Gale, 129, 131
- Ginsburg, S., 249
- Global awareness learning: JWU's MBA capstone projects to increase, 243, 259; Kennesaw's commitment to, 33, 50, 52, 53; Miami Dade College's goal for, 41; TCU's goal for, 110, 115; Tufts University's civic and, 173, 185–186; as William Paterson University's learning literacies goal, 67*e*
- Goldberger, M. L., 235
- Golde, C. M., 169
- Gong, G., 31
- Graduate program assessment: dissertation rubrics, 240–243; issues to consider for, 235–236; MBA capstone projects, 243–248; professionalism of medical students, 248–252; reflective learning portfolio reviews, 237–240
- Graduate program assessment profiles: Johnson & Wales University Graduate School, 236, 243–248; San Diego State University, 236, 237–240; University of Nebraska College of Medicine, 236, 248–252; Walden University, 236, 240–243
- Graham, W. F., 187
- Graves, G., 19
- Great (General Education Assessment Teams) Project, 229–233
- Green, A. S., 14
- Greene, J. C., 187
- Greenfield, G. M., 27
- Group Instructional Feedback Techniques (GIFTs), 16
- Guentzel, M. J., 168
- Hairston, M., 63
- Hansen Proficiencies, 96
- Hansen, W. L., 96
- Harbrace College Handbook* (Hodges et al.), 63
- Harkavy, I., 185
- Harms, J., 200, 209
- Harris, M., 110, 118
- Hart, J. R., 23, 100
- Harvard School of Public Health, 214
- Hattum-Janssen, N. van, 17
- Hauschild, K., 17, 174, 180
- Hawthorne, J., 26
- Hayek, J. C., 174
- Heindenberg, A., 19
- Hill, J., 62
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), 172
- Hocking College: assessing student academic achievement in technical programs, 258–262; Developing a Curriculum (DACUM) process used at, 259, 260; peer review used at, 254; reVISIONing Learning process used at, 259, 260, 262; Success Skills Integration project at, 13
- Hodges, J., 63
- Hoffman, D. A., 200, 213
- Howard, J., 59
- Ibarra, H., 165
- Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE), 150, 158
- The Illinois Commitment* (IBHE), 158
- Illinois State University: Assessment Advisory Council (AAC) of, 150, 158, 159; connecting assessment to program review at, 157–162; integrating assessment plans with review cycle at, 150; Program Review for Academic Assessment plan (PRAAP) rubric of, 159, 160–162; program review profile of, 157–162; surveys used by, 160; University Assessment Office (UAO) of, 159, 160, 161
- Improving/sustaining assessment: assessing mission achievement, 220–225, 262–268*t*; building context for sustainable assessment, 274–277; issues to consider for, 253–255; linking assessment with program review, 268–273; peer review of assessment plans in liberal studies, 255–258; student academic achievement in technical programs, 258–262
- Improving/sustaining assessment profiles: Colorado State University (CSU), 254, 268–273; DePaul University, 253–254, 255–258; Hocking College, 254, 258–262; Iona College, 4, 13, 254, 262–268*t*; San Jose State University (SJSU), 254–255, 274–277
- Incentives: ACE-FIPSE project provision for, 188, 190; Miami Dade College's fostering motivation using, 45; offering assessment leadership, 12; Pace University's approach to assessment, 141, 142, 144; Pennsylvania State University's career services assessment, 206, 207; for student presentations creating validity, 97; for University of Akron academic majors assessment, 90, 97, 98. *See also* Faculty; Staff; Stipends
- Indiana University-Bloomington (IU): assessing diversity and equity at, 169–172; Campus Diversity Portfolio Self-Study and Review Process at, 170–172; Enhancing Minority Attainment (EMA) conference at, 169–170; program review profile of, 169–172
- Indiana-University-Purdue University Indianapolis: DEAL model adapted at, 55; Planning for Learning and Assessment matrix, 5–6*t*
- Information literacy: assessment of, 66–75; description of, 67*e*
- Information Literacy Competence Standards for Higher Education (ACRL), 69




- Inquiry, Discover, Interpret, and Develop (I DID), 219
- Institution assessment profiles:
community colleges, 219–233;
faculty and staff development,
109–128; first-year experiences,
civic engagement, and
international learning, 173–197;
general education assessment,
55–88, 229–233; graduate
programs, 235–352; improving
and sustaining assessment,
253–277; planning and
implementation, 14–54; program
review, 149–172; student affairs,
199–217; undergraduate
academic majors, 89–108; use of
technology, 129–148. *See also*
Assessment; *specific institution*;
Student learning outcomes
- Institutional portfolio: FAMU's
assessment using, 84–87;
Oklahoma State University's
assessment using, 79–83
- Institutions: building an assessment
culture based on evidence at, 8–9;
connecting assessment to goals
and processes of, 4–5; teaching
values of, 46, 47, 118, 170
- Instruments. *See* Assessment
instruments
- International learning assessment
profiles: American Council on
Education and Consortium of
Colleges and Universities,
188–193; North Carolina State
University, 180–184
- International Writing across the
Curriculum, 144
- Internships: College Park Scholars'
assessment plan on, 167*t*; Iona
College's records of graduates
completing, 4, 268*t*; Pace
University's e-portfolios submitted
for, 142; PRISM reports provided
to employers on, 272
- Interviews: Alverno College teacher
candidate, 102–103; FAMU's use
of, 84, 85, 86; Pace University's
assessment use of, 4; Pennsylvania
State University's career services,
207; providing stipends for giving,
14; Tufts University's civic
learning, 175, 185, 186, 187;
University of North Dakota's
general education learning, 14;
U.S. Military Academy use of, 47.
See also Focus groups
- Iona College: assessing mission
achievement at, 262–273;
assessment approach taken at, 4;
comparing KPI results
(2004–2007), 266*t*–268*t*; KPIs
(Key Performance Indicators)
used at, 4, 254, 263–268*t*; Mission
KPI Report, 264*e*–265*e*
- Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement
initiative, 114
- Item response theory (IRT),
185
- Jaeger, H., 91
- Jameson, J. K., 55, 58
- Johnson & Wales University (JWU)
Graduate School: APA style and
format evaluated at, 244, 246,
247; coauthored capstone projects
evaluated at, 236, 243–248; *JWU*
APA Basics Handbook of, 246, 247;
strategic communication
competence assessment rubric
used at, 244
- Johnson, S. D., 151, 169
- Johnson and Wales University,
professional development
addressing assessment at,
16
- Jones, E. A., 14, 16, 27, 28
- Jonson, J. L., 274*fn*
- Judd, T. P., 4, 22, 32, 46
- JWU APA Basics Handbook*, 246, 247
- Kalamazoo College, 189
- Kapi'olani Community College, 189,
191
- KEEP Toolkit* (Carnegie Foundation),
168
- Keith, B., 4, 22, 32, 46
- Kelsch, A., 26
- Kennesaw State University (KSU):
assessment planning profile of,
50–54; assessment practices at,
32–33; Assurance of Learning
(AOL) initiative for program
improvement, 50–54
- Kinzie, J., 17, 174
- Kowalik, T., 144
- KPIs (Key Performance Indicators):
Iona College's mission
achievement assessed using, 254,
262–268*t*; NSSE items relevant
to, 4
- Kramer, P. I., 150, 162
- Kuh, C. V., 235
- Kuh, G. D., 17, 174
- LAASIE plan, 219, 223, 224
- Lake, K., 23, 100
- Lal, S., 25
- Leadership: empowering faculty and
staff assessment, 12–13; providing
assessment implementation,
11–12; University of Central
Florida's assessment, 12. *See also*
Faculty; Staff
- Learner-centeredness: assess course
syllabi to determine, 118–125;
rubric for assessing, 118,
119*t*–122*t*
- Learning communities: effective
assessment and role of, 27; faculty
and staff development through,
15, 109; Texas Christian
University's FLCs, 15, 109–110,
114–118
- Learning Community Conference
(Wagner College), 144
- Learning literacies: assessing, 66–67;
DePaul University's assessment of,
253–254, 255–258; four
competences of, 67*e*–68*e*;
information, 66–75;
multilevel/multiphase plan for
engaging faculty and assessing,
68*fig*–72; numerical, 66–75;
William Paterson University's
information literacy scores, 73*t*.
See also Critical thinking skills;
Proficiency-based assessment;
Writing skills
- Learning outcomes. *See* Student
learning outcomes
- Liaison Committee on Medical
Education, 248
- Licklider, B. L., 14
- Lopez, C. L., 109
- Lunsford, A., 63
- Madison, S. S., 32, 40
- Maher, B. A., 235
- Maki, P. L., 11, 22
- Malandra, G. H., 24
- MAPP (Measure of Academic
Proficiency and Progress)
[Academic Profile], 56, 76,
77–78, 85–87
- March, A., 18
- Mason, L., 229
- Mathematics skills: assessing
numerical literacy, 66–75, 68*e*;
FAMU's assessment to improve,
84–88; NEIU use of assessment to
improve, 75–79; OSU




- institutional portfolio to assess, 80–83
- Matrix: assessment planning using a, 5; Indiana-University-Purdue's Planning for Learning and Assessment, 5–6; KSU's "Competences for Graduating Seniors" report inclusion of, 52
- Matthews, R. S., 27
- Maxson, J. A., 13, 254, 258
- McDoniel, L. J., 219, 220
- McGuire, L., 55
- McKittrick, S., 144
- McNertney, E., 109, 114
- Medgar Evers College (MEC): AIM (Academic Improvement Seminar) for students, 134; Freshman Seminar at, 133, 135–136; NEWS (Networked Early-Warning System) to improve student retention at, 131–136; SP/C (Special Programs Courses) for disadvantaged students, 133; student retention focus at, 129–130; technology use profile, 131–136
- Metzger, E., 63
- Miami Dade College (MDC): assessment findings application at, 43–45; assessment planning profile of, 40–45; Learning Outcomes coordinating council (LOCC) to oversee assessment at, 42–43; MDC Strategic Plan: Student Achievement and Success at, 41; multicampus/multidisciplinary general education assessment at, 40–45; rubrics to assess learning outcomes at, 32
- Miami University: assessing scientific research skills of physics majors, 91–95; PHY 293 course assessment at, 93–95; undergraduate academic majors assessment at, 89–90; undergraduate academic majors profile, 91–95
- Michigan State University, 189
- Millett, C. M., 22, 23
- Mince, R., 220, 229
- Mission-based assessment: Iona College's, 262–273; St. Louis Community College's, 220–225
- Mixed-method assessment, 184–188
- Moravian College: College Assessment Committee (CAC) of, 104–105, 107, 108; review and feedback process to improve assessment at, 104–108; undergraduate academic majors assessment at, 90; undergraduate academic majors assessment profile, 104–108
- Morreale, J., 4
- Muffo, J., 26
- Multicampus/multidisciplinary assessment: lessons learned from, 44–45; Miami Dade College (MDC) approach to, 40–49
- Multifaceted portfolios, 140–144
- Myers, S. C., 90, 95
- National Board of Medical Examiners, 248, 249
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), 23, 103
- National Endowment for the Humanities, 177
- National Research Council (NRC), 235
- National Study of Living-Learning Programs, 168
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): challenges related to using, 175; CLASSE (Classroom Survey of Student Engagement) adaptation of, 175, 193–197; disaggregating institutional results using the, 193; FAMU's use of, 85, 86, 87; Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University use of, 57; Illinois State University use of, 160; Iona College's KPIs relevance to items of, 4; NEIU assessment use of, 76; Ohio University's First Year Experience study using, 26; St. Mary's College use of, 174, 177; student engagement assessment using, 17. *See also* Surveys
- Needs assessment: identifying assessment topics, 15; Widener University faculty, 15
- Nelson, M. A., 90, 95
- Nesheim, B. E., 168
- Neuhoff, J. G., 24
- New York State Education Department (NYSED), 145
- NEWS (Networked Early-Warning System), 131–136
- Ng, L., 27
- North Carolina State University (NCSU): DEAL model developed at, 55; First Year College (FYC) at, 174, 180–184; First Year College Student Experiences Survey (SES) developed by, 17, 174; Village Advisory Council at, 181–182
- Northeastern Illinois University (NEIU): approach for assessing general education developed at, 56, 76; First Year Experience course at, 56, 75; general education assessment profile of, 75–79
- Northern Iowa, professional development addressing assessment at, 15–16
- Numerical literacy: assessment of, 66–75; description of, 68*e*
- Nutt Williams, E., 18, 176
- Obenshain, S. S., 249
- Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, 72
- Ohia, U. O., 19, 57
- Ohio University (OU): measuring level of student engagement at, 17; reform based on assessment findings at, 26–27
- Oklahoma State University (OSU): *Criteria and Goals for General Education Courses* document of, 80, 81; general education assessment profile of, 79–83; General Education Assessment Task Force formed at, 56–57, 79–80; institutional portfolio assessment used at, 79–83
- Olsen, D. R., 31
- Olson, C., 175, 188
- Online surveys. *See* Web-based surveys
- Orzoff, J., 236, 240
- Ostriker, J. P., 235
- O'Sullivan, B., 18, 176
- Quimet, J., 175, 193
- Outing, K., 17, 174, 180
- Pace University: assessment approach taken at, 4; information literacy skills (2002–2007) recorded at, 142*t*; multifaceted electronic portfolio approach used at, 130, 140–144; Pace Presidential Learning Assessment Grant for pilot e-portfolio, 141; technology use profile of, 140–144
- Palo Alto College, 189
- Palomba, C. A., 11
- Pascarella, E. T., 17, 174




- Paul, R., 55, 59, 61
 Paulson, K., 27
 Payne, D. G., 22
 Peer review: assessment using, 5, 149, 151; Colorado State University's use of, 270; CSBSJU's use of, 164; of DePaul University's assessment plans, 253, 256–258; Hocking college's use of, 254; Illinois State University's assessment and program, 159; Indiana University Bloomington's use of, 170, 171; USP's use of, 62, 65. *See also* Feedback
 Peinovich, P., 240
 Pennipede, B., 4
 Pennsylvania State University: Career Services Pulse Survey used at, 206–208; CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) software used at, 206–207; Penn State Pulse program at, 200, 206–209; using telephone/Web-based surveys for career services assessment at, 205–209
 Pet-Armacost, J., 12
 Peterson, M. W., 11, 13
 Phelan, S., 249
 Phelps, S. F., 23
 PHY 293 (Miami University), 93–95
 Physics research skills, 89, 90, 91–95
 Pomerantz, A., 16
 Portfolios: accreditation review of student, 23; electronic, 23–24, 95–99, 130, 140–144, 188–197; institutional, 79–83, 84–87; integrating student/program assessment with teacher candidate, 100–104; IU's Campus Diversity Portfolio Self-Study and Review Process, 170–172; multifaceted, 140–144; reflective learning, 236, 237–243. *See also* Assessment instruments
 Portland State University, 189
 Pribbenow, D. A., 169
 PRISM system (CSU), 269, 270, 271, 272
 Problem-based learning (PBL): used in medical and dental schools, 17; project-led education (PLE) similarities to, 17–18
 Processes: assessing outcomes as well as, 16–18, 27–28; connecting assessment to institutional, 4–5; IU's assessment of diversity, 169–172; program review, 149–172; review and feedback, 104–108
 Proficiency-based assessment: critical thinking skills, 55, 58–75, 84–88; e-portfolios used for, 95–99; mathematics skills, 66–79, 80–88; physics research skills, 89, 90, 91–95; science skills, 80–83, 91–99. *See also* Communication skills; Learning literacies; Writing skills
 Program review process: assessing diversity and equity at multicampus institution, 169–172; College Park Scholars' new plan for, 164–169; Colorado State's connecting assessment and, 254, 268–273; Illinois State's connecting assessment to, 157–162; integrating assessment, program review, and disciplinary reports, 162–164; issues to consider for, 149–151; ongoing systematic assessment approach to, 152–157
 Program review profiles: Brigham Young University (BYU), 150, 151–157; College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University (CSBSJU), 150–151, 151, 162–164; Illinois State University, 150, 157–162; Indiana University-Bloomington (IU), 151, 169–172; University of Maryland, 151, 164–169
 Project-led education (PLE), 17–18
 Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 132
 Pusateri, T. P., 50
 Reliability: JWU's cross-discipline assessment to increase, 243, 244; Miami Dade College's training to increase, 45; professional development for increasing, 16; of student learning measurements, 23; Tompkins Cortland Community College's challenge with, 227
 Resources: American Council on Education, 190–191; Bellevue University, 138; Binghamton University, 146; BYU, 34–35, 154; California State University, Sacramento, 203; Colorado State University (CSU), 270; commitment of sufficient assessment, 13–14; Community College of Baltimore County (CCBC), 231; DePaul University, 256; FAMU, 85; Ferris State University, 123; Hocking College, 260; Illinois State University, 160; Iona College, 263; IU-Bloomington, 171; KSU, 51; MDC, 42–43; Medgar Evers College, 133; Miami University, 92; Moravian College, 106; NCSU, 59; NEIU, 76; OSU, 81; Pace University, 142; Pennsylvania State University, 206–207; St. Louis Community College (SLCC), 222–223; St. Mary's College, 178; San Diego State University, 238; San Jose State University (SJSU), 276; Texas Christian University, 116; Thompkins Cortland Community College, 226; Truman State University, 215; Tufts University, 186; University of Akron, 97; University of Alabama, 39, 194; University of Hawaii at Manoa (UH-M), 211; University of Maryland, 168; University of Northern Iowa, 112–113; USF, 64; USMA, 48; Walden University, 241; Widener University, 126; William Paterson University, 72
 Retention Alert System, 133
 Review and feedback process, 104–108
 Rickards, W. H., 23, 100
 Riedel, E., 240
 Rodicio, L., 32, 40
 Rogers, G., 23, 100
 Rosenberg, W., 4, 254, 262
 Rubrics: Academic Profile (now MAPP), 56, 76, 77–78, 85–87; addressing complex performances, 226; CLAQWA (Cognitive Level and Quality of Writing Assessment), 56, 63–64, 65; DEAL model, 55, 58, 60–61; Hansen Proficiencies, 96; JWU's strategic communication competence assessment, 244; learning outcomes explicit through dissertation, 236, 240–243; learning-centeredness, 118, 119t–122t; Miami Dade College assessment using, 32; Miami University's Scientific Inquiry Rubric, 92; Program



- Review for Academic Assessment plan (PRAAP), 159, 160–162; sample learning literacies, 70e–72e; scoring students' reflections using, 55; Standards of Critical Thinking, 55, 59, 61; Tompkins Cortland Community College use of, 225–229
- Ruskiewicz, J., 63
- Rutter, R. A., 7, 14
- St. Cloud State University, 13
- St. Louis Community College (SLCC): DACUM curriculum development used at, 223; Inquiry, Discover, Interpret, and Develop (I DID) approach used at, 219, 222; LAASIE approach to assessment at, 219, 222, 223, 224; mission-based assessment used at, 220–225
- St. Martin's Handbook* (Lunsford & Connors), 63
- St. Mary's College (Maryland): examining new ways to assess student learning at, 18; First Year Experience at, 178–179; improving student engagement and core curriculum at, 176–180; NSSE data used by, 174, 178
- St. Norbert College: assessment plan standards used at, 7; Title III funding received by faculty of, 14
- San Diego State University: faculty-student collaboration at, 238; improving course syllabi using assessment at, 238–239; reflective learning portfolio used at, 236, 237–243
- San Jose State University (SJSU): annual assessment reports at, 275; building context for sustainable assessment, 274–277; components used to build assessment, 274–275; process of building culture of assessment, 254–255
- Schnelker, D. L., 14
- Schrader, P. G., 173
- Schuh, J. H., 17
- Sciame-Giesecke, S., 151, 169
- Science skills: Miami University's assessment of physics majors and, 91–95; OSU institutional portfolio to assess, 80–83; University of Akron's assessment of computer, 95–99
- Scientific Inquiry Rubric, 92
- Scott Foresman Handbook for Writers* (Hairston, Ruskiewicz, & Friend), 63
- Scott, V., 16
- Seawright, K., 150, 152
- Seawright, L., 150, 152
- Service learning: impact on student attitudes by, 174; NCSU's First Year College (FYC), 17, 174, 180–184; Tufts University civic learning through, 184–188
- Seybert, J., 219
- Sherohman, J., 13
- Smallwood, R. A., 175, 193
- SMART objectives, 202
- Smith, B. A., 13, 254, 258
- Snell, J., 254, 255, 274
- Social values, 110, 115
- Southern Association of Colleges and School (SACS), 62, 84
- Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville, cognitive peer coaching at, 16
- Staff: empowering assessment leadership roles to, 12–13; providing credible evidence of student learning, 21–24. *See also* Incentives; Leadership; Stakeholders
- Staff development: back-mapping approach to, 111–114; FLCs (faculty learning communities) for faculty and, 15, 109–110, 114–118
- Staff development profiles: Ferris State University, 118–125; Texas Christian University, 114–118; University of Northern Iowa, 111–114; Widener University, 125–128
- Stakeholders: engaging, 3–4; providing credible evidence of learning to, 21–24; trustees as, 3. *See also* Employers; Faculty; Staff
- Standards of Critical Thinking rubric, 55, 59, 61
- State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), 28
- Stewart, G. M., 151, 164
- Stickler, L. M., 22
- Stipends: assessment and summer, 57, 80; faculty development, 64, 76; as faculty incentives, 142, 190, 191; interview, 14. *See also* Incentives
- Stoddard, H. A., 236, 248
- Stover, L., 18, 176
- Strategic planning: assessment sustainability through, 254; Colorado State University's, 270; Indiana University Bloomington's approach to, 171; MDC Strategic Plan: Student Achievement and Success, 41; Pace University's, 4
- Stratton, R. W., 90, 95
- Student affairs assessment: creating and implementing comprehensive, 201–205; educational sanctions for first-time alcohol policy violators, 213–217; issues to consider for, 199–200; satisfaction and use of student support services, 209–213; telephone and Web-based surveys used for career services, 205–209
- Student affairs assessment profiles: California State University, Sacramento, 201–205; Pennsylvania State University, 205–209; Truman State University, 213–217; University of Hawaii at Manoa, 209–213
- Student affairs professionals: engaging in assessment, 3; University of Alabama's assessment of, 38–40
- Student engagement assessment: assessing different levels approach to, 17; at center of expected learning outcomes at BYU, 33–38; description of, 3; meaningful information from, 174; North Carolina State University enhancing first-year experience using, 180–184; St. Mary's College's core curriculum improvement using, 176–180; Tufts University approach to civic learning and, 175, 184–188; University of Alabama's CLASSE approach to classroom, 193–197
- Student Information System Integration, 133
- The Student Learning Imperative: Implications for Student Affairs* (American College Personnel Association), 214
- Student learning outcomes: AACU identification of three types of crucial, 173; assessing levels of, 17–18; assessing processes as well as, 16–18; BYU's practice of putting students at center of, 33–38; factors to consider when measuring, 22–23; implementing ongoing assessment of, 125–128; linking assessment practices to, 31–33; made explicit through



- dissertation rubrics, 236, 240–243; promoting transparency in, 24; providing credible evidence of, 21–24. *See also* Institution assessment profiles
- Student Portfolio and Information Form (SPIF), 189–191, 192–193
- Student retention: Medgar Evers College's focus on, 129–130; NEWS (networked Early-Warning System) to improve, 131–136
- Students: Binghamton University's online survey of, 130–131, 144–148; MEC's AIM (Academic Improvement Seminar) for, 134; MEC's SP/C (Special Programs Courses) for disadvantaged, 133; sanctions for first-time alcohol policy violators, 213–217. *See also* First year experiences
- Success Skills Integration (Hocking College), 13
- Surveys: Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement, 160; Binghamton University's online, 130–131, 144–148; Career Services Pulse Survey (Penn State), 206; CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) software for, 206–207; CIRP Freshman Survey, 76; CLASSE (Classroom Survey of Student Engagement), 175, 193–197; College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), 17, 200, 210–211; Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), 44; CPAAS (TC Civic and Political Activities and Attitudes Survey), 185–188; Current Practices Inventory, 26; Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, 160; First Year College Student Experiences Survey (SES), 17; Pennsylvania State University's online, 205–209; Student Portfolio and Information Form (SPIF), 189–191, 192–193; TrueOutcomes Survey Modules, 132, 133; University of Hawaii at Manoa's use of online, 210–211. *See also* Assessment instruments; National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Suskie, L., 5, 11, 26
- Sustaining assessment. *See* Improving/sustaining assessment
- Syllabi: determining learner-centeredness of, 118–125; reflective portfolio used to improve, 238–239; rubric for assessing, 118, 119*t*–122*t*
- Tan, R.J.B., 175, 184
- Taylor, B.A.P., 91
- Teacher candidate portfolios, 100–104
- Technology competence: assessment of, 66–75; description of, 67*e*; Hocking College's assessment of, 258–262; Miami University's physics research skills, 89, 90, 91–95; University of Akron's assessment of, 95. *See also* Engineering education
- Technology use profiles: Bellevue University, 130, 137–140; Binghamton University (State University of New York), 130–131, 144–148; Medgar Evers College (City University of New York), 129, 131–136; Pace University, 130, 140–144
- Technology-enabled assessment: CATI (computer-assisted telephone interviewing) software, 206–207; examining different approaches to, 129–131; improving first-year student retention through NEWS, 131–136; multifaceted portfolio from writing program collaboration, 140–144; online surveys, 144–148, 200, 205–211; PRF (professional rating form), 249–252; process of adopting a Web-based system for assessment, 137–140. *See also* Electronic portfolios
- Terenzini, P. T., 17, 174
- Terkla, D. G., 175, 184
- Terry, R., 150, 152
- Texas Christian University: core curriculum at, 115, 117, 118; faculty learning communities (FLCs) at, 15, 109–110, 114–118
- Thompkins Cortland Community College: capstone courses at, 219–220; rubrics for reflection, deliberation, and revision of outcomes, 225–229
- Title III Strengthening Institutions Grant, 7, 14
- Topping, S., 175, 184
- Triangulation, 46–49
- Troxel, W. G., 173
- TrueOutcomes, 132–133
- TrueOutcomes Assessment Manager, 132–133
- TrueOutcomes Survey Modules, 132, 133
- Truman State University: assessing sanctions of first-time alcohol policy violators at, 213–217; assessment process development at, 200; OCCS sanction assignments program developed at, 214
- Trustees assessment stakeholders, 3
- Tufts University: CPAAS (TC Civic and Political Activities and Attitudes Survey) used at, 185–188; mixed-method approach to student engagement/civil learning assessment at, 175, 184–188; Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation (OIR&E) at, 186; Tisch College of Citizenship and Public Service at, 185, 186, 188
- Undergraduate academic majors. *See* Academic majors assessment
- United States Medical Licensure Exam, 248
- United States Military Academy (USMA): the academic goals supporting mission of, 4–5; learner outcome mission at, 32; “state of the union addresses” assessment reports at, 19; student learning evidence gathered at, 22; triangulation of data sources used at, 46–49; values of, 46, 47
- University of Akron: e-portfolios used in assessment at, 95–99; undergraduate academic majors assessment at, 90
- University of Alabama (UA): assessment findings application at, 39–40; assessment planning profile of, 38–40; CLASSE (Classroom Survey of Student Engagement) used at, 175, 193–197; measuring student engagement at classroom level at, 193–197; planning assessment in student affairs, 38–40; student learning outcomes mission statement at, 32
- University of Central Florida: administration commitment to



- assessment at, 12; Sacramento State's consultation with experts from, 201
- University of Hawaii at Manoa (UH-M): assessing satisfaction/use of student support services at, 209–213; College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) used at, 200, 210–211
- University of Houston, 8
- University of Maryland: College Park Scholars' new assessment plan at, 151, 164–169; developing a “big question” narrative for assessment at, 151; program review profile of, 164–169
- University of Massachusetts-Amherst, 206
- University of Minho (Portugal), 17–18
- University of Missouri, 223
- University of Nebraska College of Medicine (UNCOM): compensating for “grade inflation” at, 250; measuring professionalism of medical students, 248–252; online assessment approach taken at, 236, 249–252; professional rating form (PRF) developed at, 249–252
- University of North Dakota: Bush Foundation funding longitudinal study at, 14; reform based on assessment results at, 26
- University of Northern Iowa: back-mapping approach taken at, 111–114; faculty and staff development profile, 111–114; professional development addressing assessment at, 15
- University of South Florida (USF): CLAQWA rubric developed at, 56, 63–64, 65; general education assessment profile of, 62–66; improving students' writing and thinking through assessment at, 62–66
- Upcraft, L., 206
- U.S. Department of Education, 24
- Valesey, B., 15, 110, 125
- Validity: incentives for student presentations as creating, 97; Miami Dade College's assessment evidence of, 42; PRF (professionalism rating form), 251; of student learning measurements, 22–23
- Values: civic, 174; ethical, 26, 84, 85, 265*e*, 267*t*; social, 110, 115; teaching awareness of, 180, 182, 185; teaching institutional, 46, 47, 118, 170; U.S. Military Academy, 46, 47
- Varlotta, L., 27, 199, 201
- Vaughn, D. S., 11, 13
- Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU), 138
- Virginia Tech, 26
- Voorhees, R. A., 27
- Wadley, J. Y., 17, 26
- Walcerz, Douglas, 129, 131
- Walden University: “anonymous reviewer” feedback problem at, 240; rubrics used to evaluate dissertations and theses at, 236, 240–243
- Walvoord, B. E., 7, 11
- WEAVEonline system, 130, 138, 140
- Web-based surveys: Binghamton University's use of, 144–148; Pennsylvania State University's use of, 205–209; University of Hawaii at Manoa's use of, 200, 209–211
- WebCT courseware, 113
- Wechsler, H., 214
- Wehlburg, C. M., 15, 109, 114
- West Point. *See* United States Military Academy (USMA)
- West Virginia University, professional development seminars offered at, 14
- Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), 201
- Western Heritage curriculum, 177
- Whitt, E. J., 17
- Widener University: faculty needs survey developed at, 15; Implementation Committee for Assessment of Student Learning at, 127; implementing ongoing assessment of student learning, 125–128; Task Force for Student Learning survey of faculty at, 110, 125
- Widener University Self-Study Report (2006), 126
- William Paterson University: assessing learning literacies, 66–75; general education assessment profile, 66–75; information literacy scores at, 73*t*; instrument based on information literacy competence standards developed at, 56
- Williford, M., 17, 26
- Wilson, B. J., 15, 109, 111, 157
- Wilson, M. A. (Mardell), 150, 157
- Wilson, M. (Midge), 253, 255
- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (DPI), 23, 103
- Wisniewski, J., 175, 188
- Wittberg, P., 55
- Writing program collaboration (Pace University), 140–144
- Writing skills: APA style and format evaluation, 244, 246, 247; assessing learning literacies and, 66–67; DePaul University's assessment of, 253–254, 255–258; FAMU's assessment to improve, 84–88; Johnson & Wales University Graduate School assessment of, 236, 243–248; Northeastern Illinois University assessment to improve, 75–79; OSU institutional portfolio to assess, 80–83; Pace University's multifaceted portfolio approach to assessing, 140–144; St. Mary's College's assessment to improve, 176–180; USF assessment to improve, 62–66. *See also* Learning literacies; Proficiency-based assessment
- Yarrison-Rice, J. M., 91