

INDEX

- Accountability, 7–17, 19–35; assessment for, 9–10, 86–87; Texas experience with, 49–59; Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) for, 39–49
- Accreditation, 11, 15
- ACT Workkeys, 73
- Adelman, C., 35
- Alexander, Lamar, 12
- Alverno College, abilities-based curriculum structured around interdisciplinary competencies, 8
- American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), 20, 84
- American Association of Community Colleges (AACC), 13
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), 12, 24, 39, 72, 73
- Assessment, 60; and accountability, 7–17; benchmarking, 15; collective responsibility, 14; for continuous accountability, 9–10; for continuous improvement, 9–10; history of, 7–8; instruments, 14–15; paradigms of, 9–11; pioneering institutional efforts, 8; standardized tests, 8–9; state post-secondary review entities (SPREs), 9; and student academic achievement, 8; transparency, 15–16
- Assessment instruments, 14–15
- Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U), 14–15, 59–60, 86
- Liberal Education and America's Promise initiative, 15; VALUE project, 59–60
- Available data, gulf between useful data and, 20
- Banta, T., 34
- Basken, P., 34
- Benchmarking, 10, 15
- Blalock, Hubert M. Jr., 21, 34
- Borden, Victor M. H., 19, 34, 37, 83, 89
- Business Higher Education Forum, and assessment/accountability, 62
- CAAP, *See* Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)
- CAAP *Technical Handbook* (ACT), 25, 27
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 81
- Chatman, S., 34
- CLA, *See* Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
- Collective responsibility, 14
- College completion rate, 62
- College Portrait (VSA), 41–47; information for students and families, 40–41; student and family information, 42–43; student experiences and perceptions, 43–44; student learning outcomes, 44–45
- Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), 12, 13, 15, 24–25, 45; *CAAP Technical Handbook* (ACT), 25, 27; content validity, 25; criterion validity for, 25; and critical thinking, 34; and inferential leap, 27; value-added assessment, 27
- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), 12, 13–15, 24–25, 28; accountability indicators, 32; conceptual model, 25–26; construct validity, 28; content validity, 28; and critical thinking, 34; criticism of value-added measure as employed by, 29; open-ended responses required for, 54; performance tasks, 25; scoring process, 25–27; unit of analysis, 54; validation of, 26; validity issues, 28–31; value-added assessment measure, 27–29; value-added CLA score as a measure of institutional effectiveness, 31
- Common Data Set (CDS) Initiative, 43
- Concurrent validity, 22
- Construct validity, 22–23
- Content validity, 22
- Contextual validity, 23
- Continuous improvement, assessment for, 9–10
- Core Educational Outcomes Task Force, 73
- Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), 14
- Council for the Aid to Education (CAE), 24–25, 27, 28–29

- Criterion validity, 22
 Critical thinking, 28, 34
 Curiosity Index, 73
- Defining Issues Test, 73
 Differential validity, 23–24
- E-portfolio, 64–65, 67, 68; assembly, 65; assessment, 15, 61
 Ecological fallacy, potential for, 30
 Ecological validity, 23
 El-Khawas, E., 9
 Electronic portfolios, *See* E-portfolio
 ETS Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP), 13, 15, 24; and critical thinking, 34; exam, areas assessed by, 25; validity studies, 25
 Ewell, Peter T., 7, 8, 83
 External validity, 23
- Face validity, 22
 Finney, J., 8
 Focus groups, 76–79; open-ended questions in, 78
 Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE), 60, 71; grant to NASULGC/AASCU/AAC&U, 73
- Group facilitator/note taker, survey, 76
 Global awareness outcomes, survey, 75
 Greater Expectations project (Association of American Colleges and Universities), 59
- Hammang, John M., 39, 48, 84
 Higher education, collaborative action, call to, 86–87; common goals for, 62–63; credibility and utility, 85–86; finding a constructive path for, 84–86; shared responsibility and collaboration, 85; standardization and differentiation, 84–85; and VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education), 68–70
 Higher Education Act (HEA), 9, 11
 Higher Education Data Sharing consortium, 86
 Higher education institution accountability measures, validity standards for (table), 33
- Institution-centered transparency, 15–16
 Institution-level assessments, 47
 Institutional aggregate scores, validity of comparisons among, 23
 Institutional assessment, Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) for, 39–49
 Institutional research (IR), pivotal role of, 87–88
 Instruments of assessment, 14–15
 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 19–20
Integrity in the College Curriculum (Association of American Colleges), 8
 Internal validity, 23
Involvement in Learning (National Institute of Education), 8
 Item development, survey, 75–76
- Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics* (Wainer), 29
- Keller, Christine M., 39, 48, 84
- Lederman, Doug, 87
 Lentz, C., 17
 Liberal Education and America's Promise (LEAP) initiative, AAC&U, 59
- MAPP, *See* ETS Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)
 Measurement validity, 19–35; defined, 21; evolving concept of, 21–22; as the sine qua non of measurement, 21–22
 Miller, Charles, 12, 49–50
- NACIQI, *See* National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI)
 National accountability demands, initial reaction to, 60
 National Advisory Committee on Institutional Quality and Integrity (NACIQI), 12
 National Assessment of Adult Literacy, 62
 National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU), 13
 National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC), 12, 24, 40, 72, 73, 86
 National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 19–20

- National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education higher-education poll, 63
- National Commission on Higher Education Accountability, 11
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), 12
- New Leadership for Student Learning and Accountability* (Association of American Colleges and Universities and Council for Higher Education Accreditation), 14–15
- Northeast Missouri State University, value-added testing to demonstrate appropriate academic levels for graduates, 8
- NSSE, *See* National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
- Office of Academic Affairs, University of Texas (UT) System, 50
- Ouimet, Judith A., 71, 82, 84
- Our Underachieving Colleges* (Bok), 63
- Oversight board, VSA, 46
- One-on-one interviews, 79–80
- Paradigms of assessment, 9–11; assessment for continuous accountability, 9–10; assessment for continuous improvement, 9–10; descriptors, 9–10
- Pass-rate exams, and quality of academic programs, 52
- Perry, Rick, 49
- Pike, Gary R., 71, 82, 83, 84, 89
- Pilot test, 80–81
- Predictive validity, 22
- Quantitative indicators, 60
- Reference points, for comparison/tracking progress, 10
- Reflective Judgment Interview, 73
- Reliability, 21
- Reyes, Pedro, 49, 58, 84
- Rhodes, Terrel L., 59, 70, 84
- Rincon, Roberta, 49, 58, 84
- Sampling, 24
- Scores, need for, 60
- Secretary's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 7
- Simon, Herbert, 20
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), 53
- Spellings Commission, 7, 9, 11, 13, 20, 49, 71, 84
- Spellings, Margaret, 11, 19–20
- Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA/APA/NCME), 32
- State postsecondary review entities (SPREs), 9
- Statistical validity, 23
- Student achievement, calls for higher education accountability and accomplishment in, 62
- Student Growth Work Group, conclusions of, 73
- Student learning: assessment, Texas experience with, 49–59; defined, 20; inferential leap to institutional effectiveness, 26–27; sharing responsibility for, 83–89
- Student learning outcomes, VSA, 44–45
- Survey of students' workplace skills, civic engagement, and global awareness, 71, 82; background, 72–75; civic engagement outcomes, 75; development groups, 75–76; development of, 75–76; development steps (chart), 74; domains in the degrees of preparation survey, 77; focus group facilitator/note taker, 76; focus groups, 76–79; global awareness outcomes, 75; item development, 75–76; one-on-one interviews, 79–80; open-ended questions, in focus groups, 78; pilot test, 80–81; workplace skills outcomes, 75
- Team Leadership Practices Inventory, 73
- Technology-based nature of VALUE, 68
- Tilghman, Shirley, 13
- Time for Results* (National Governors Association), 8
- Transparency, 15–16
- University of Tennessee Knoxville, department-level assessment program structured around academic program review, 8
- University of Texas (UT) System, accountability approach, 50; and accountability/student learning assessment, 49–58; board of regents targets, 51; and CLA, 50, 51, 53–57; college learning assessment, 52–54; Faculty Advisory Council, 50; faculty committees, 50–51; and MAPP, 51; Office of Academic Affairs, 50; pass-rate exams,

- and quality of academic programs, 52; student assessment limitations/possibilities, 54–56; student learning assessment, 52; student learning assessment approaches, 50; student outcomes model, 51–52; student persistence and graduation rates indicators, 51
- Validity, as argument, 24; concurrent, 22; construct, 22–23; content, 22; contextual, 23; criterion, 22; differential, 23–24; ecological, 23; external, 23; face, 22; internal, 23; as a measure of institutional effectiveness, 24–25; predictive, 22; standards for higher education institution accountability measures, 31–34; statistical, 23; types of, 22–23
- Value-added assessment, 29; and CLA, 27–29
- VALUE (Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education), 59–70; achievable/useful results, 66–67; advantages of, 67–68; defined, 59; description of, 64–65; e-portfolio, 64–65, 67, 68; e-portfolio assembly, 65; e-portfolio assessment, 61; and the future of higher education, 68–70; integrative learning, 65; internal and external comparisons, 68; learning outcomes, measures of, 66–67; mechanics of, 66; metarubrics, 66; National Advisory Board, 60; and need for multiple measures of multiple abilities and skills, 63–64; recognized need and challenges, 62–64; replicability of, 68; robustness of, 68; rubric development, 64; rubrics, 61; and student learning expectations, 61, 69; technology-based nature of, 68; visibility of, 68
- Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), 12–13, 24–25, 32–33, 49, 71, 84, 86; for accountability and institutional assessment, 39–48; College Portrait, 41–47; defined, 40; goals of, 40; information for students and families, 40–41; oversight board, 46; student and family information, 42–43; student experiences and perceptions, 43–44; student learning outcomes, 44–45; U.S. Department of Education grant (2007), 46
- Young, John W., 19, 37, 83
- Yudof, Mark, 50