

# Index

*Note to Index:* An *e* following a page number denotes an exhibit on that page; an *f* following a page number denotes a figure on that page; a *t* following a page number denotes a table on that page.

\$UPPORT, 76–78

Accountability: assessment for  
accountability concept, 30–31;  
increasing call for, 168–170; as  
secondary purpose of assessment,  
154–156

Accreditation: as current higher  
education issue, 49–51;  
institutional preparation for,  
164; move to qualitative process,  
6–8; regional, 156–159, 165; *vs.*  
assessment, 11–12

Accreditation mandates, 29–30

Alignment, constructive, 175–176

Allen, M. J., 40, 154

Alstete, J., 157

Alternative higher learning  
institutions, 22

Alumni: giving by, 52, 53; surveys for,  
10, 15, 28, 45, 69, 78, 118, 126

Angelo, T., 3, 26, 36–38

Assessment: authentic, 138–140,  
173–174; closing feedback loop,  
5–6 (fig), 25; as current higher  
education issue, 48–49; defining,  
23–24, 154; definition of student  
learning in, 12; lack of success

of, 1–2, 3–4; mandating, 153–154;  
process of good program, 155–156;  
as punishment, 31, 133–134; as  
secondary purpose of account-  
ability, 154–156; tracking across  
institutions, 171–172; using to  
inform teaching/learning, 10–11;  
*vs.* accreditation, 11–12. *See also*  
Embedded assessment; Transforma-  
tive assessment

Assessment culture matrix, 7–8

Assessment-for-accountability data, 5

Assessment-for-learning paradigm, 4–5

Association of American Colleges  
and Universities (AAC&U),  
169–170, 176

Astin, A., 20

Audience, outside institution,  
161–164; language use in reporting  
to, 162–163; transparency in  
reporting to, 163–164

Authentic assessment, 138–140,  
173–174. *See also* Embedded  
assessment

Banks, W. M., 174

Banta, T., 43–44, 54–55, 80, 83–84,  
85–87, 121, 153, 160, 167–168

- Bellas, M., 42  
 Biggs, J., 175  
 Bloom, B., 22  
 Boyer, E., 43  
 Brown, K., 76  
 Budgeting and planning, 56–57, 112–114, 113f  
 Bureaucratic-structural barriers, to collaboration, 80–81  
 Butte Community College district, 56–57
- Campuswide model, of assessment implementation, 128–131  
 Carey, K., 51  
 Chickering, A., 20  
 Classroom assessment techniques (CATs), 33–35; Minute Paper, 35; Muddiest Point, 35–36  
 Collaboration, among students, 176–178  
 Collaboration, cross-campus, 83–89; bureaucratic-structural barriers to, 80–81; consensus on learning outcomes concept, 85; cultural-historical barriers to, 80–81; curriculum/assessment planning, 83–85; data gathering/use, 83; entire student on-campus experience, 86–87; institution-specific outcomes/processes/measures, 85–86; leadership barriers to, 81, 83–89; learning goals in/out of classroom, 85; student affairs assessment, 82–83. *See also* Collaboration, cross-campus assessment methods  
 Collaboration, cross-campus assessment methods, 89–98; communication and coordination systems, 90–91; community-building, 97–98; overcoming barriers, 92–95; support systems, 95–96  
 Collaborative-integration theory, 177  
 College Student Experiences Questionnaire, 27
- Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), 27, 52, 130, 169, 172  
 Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 167  
 Community-building, 97–98  
 Constructive alignment, 175–176  
 Cooperative Institutional Research Program, 15, 27  
 Core values, institutional, 103–104, 106  
 Cottrell, S., 45–46  
 Council for Higher Education (CHEA), 49–50  
 Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS), 109–110  
 Course-based assessments, 148  
 Cross, P., 36  
 Cross-campus collaboration. *See* Collaboration, cross-campus assessment methods  
 Crowe, S., 63  
 Cultural climate, for assessment, 57–59  
 Cultural-historical barriers, to collaboration, 80–81  
 Current higher education issues, 47–53; accreditation, 49–51; assessment, 48–49; national rankings, 51–53  
 Curriculum mapping, 145–146t
- Databases, 112, 173  
 Departmental-focused assessment, implementing, 123–128  
 Departmental/program/unit outcomes, 105–107, 112, 124–127, 129, 130, 131  
 Detwiler, T., 54–55  
 Development, student psychosocial, 20–21  
 Direct measures, of outcomes, 28, 66–68, 67e, 126  
 Dodd, A., 112  
 Dooris, M., 71
- Eaton, J., 50  
 Ebbinghaus, H., 19

- Electronic portfolios, 173
- Embedded assessment: benefits  
of, 141–143; course-based, 148;  
curriculum mapping, 145–146t;  
data comparison issues, 144–145;  
defining, 140; designing measures  
for, 145–148; modifying syllabi to  
reflect outcomes for, 149–150; and  
outside-the-classroom activities,  
149; practices, 140–141; principles  
of, 150–152; trust issues in, 143–144
- Employer surveys, 70
- Ewell, P., 21, 24, 99–100
- Experience surveys. *See* Satisfaction  
surveys
- Faculty, traditional concerns of,  
39–47; scholarship, 43–44; service,  
46–47; teaching, 44–46; time,  
40–43; typical responses to assess-  
ment, 39–40
- Faculty advisory committees, 70–72
- Faculty development, 8–10, 74–75, 118
- Faculty support for assessment, encour-  
aging, 61–78; with assessment  
data, 72–74; with faculty advisory  
committees, 70–72; with guid-  
ance for writing outcomes/plans,  
63–66, 64e; with meaningful direct  
measures, 66–68, 67e–68e; with  
professional development/scholarly  
work, 74–75; with surveys/other  
indirect measures, 68–70; with sus-  
tained institutional support, 75–78
- Faculty Survey of Student Engage-  
ment (FSSE), 41–42
- Farmer, D., 141
- Feedback loop, closing, 5–6 (fig), 25
- Fendrich, L., 3
- Fink, L. D., 176
- Finkelstein, M., 46
- Formal *vs.* informal learning, 174
- Glassick, C., 43
- Goals, institutional, 103–104, 106
- Grades, and assessment, 32–33
- Hall, M., 172
- Harris, O., 39
- Huber, M., 43
- Hutchings, P., 19, 20
- Ideal graduate exercise, 65, 124
- In-class learning, 80
- Indiana University-Purdue-  
University-Indianapolis  
(IUPUI), 56
- Indirect measures, of outcomes,  
68e–70, 126
- Informal *vs.* formal learning, 174
- Institutional assessment: charac-  
teristics of champion for, 54–55;  
creating cultural climate for, 57–59;  
as dynamic, 59–60; link with  
planning and budgeting, 56–57;  
organizational responsibility for,  
53–56; sample assessment rubric, 55
- Institutional effectiveness: overview  
of, 99–102. *See also* Institutional  
effectiveness program elements
- Institutional effectiveness program  
elements, 99–119; adequate  
support, 116–118; appropriate  
measures, 107–110; collaborative/  
cross-campus data analysis, 111;  
creating a climate for, 118–119;  
departmental/program/unit-level  
outcomes, 105–107; institutional-  
level outcomes, 104–105; mission  
and goals alignment, 102–104;  
overcoming resistance, 114–116;  
planning and budgeting, 112–114;  
using data collected, 111–112
- Institutional-level outcomes, 93,  
104–105, 111, 129–130
- Instructional fidelity, 151
- Instrument, assessment: home-grown,  
27–29; portfolios, 28–29, 32,  
69–70, 82, 107, 125, 131;  
published, 27
- Integrated Postsecondary Education  
Data System (IPEDS), 160
- Internship, student, 70

- Jacobs, J., 40–41  
 Jones, E., 45–46  
 Jorgenson, M., 164  
 Journals, refereed, 44
- Knight, A. B., 176  
 Knight, P. T., 174  
 Kramer, P., 121  
 Kuh, G., 80, 83–84, 85–87
- Leadership barriers, to collaboration, 81  
 Leadership development, 110  
 Light, R., 84  
 Local institutional assessment/  
 transformation, 159–160  
 Lopez, C., 7
- Madison, B., 23–24  
 Maeroff, G., 43  
 Magolda, P. M., 87–88  
 Marchese, T., 19, 20  
 Mastery learning, 21–22, 24  
 Metcalf, J., 61, 62, 72  
 Michaelson, L. K., 176  
 Middle States Commission on Higher  
 Education, 101–102  
 Minute Paper, 35  
 Mission, institutional, 13, 14, 79, 105,  
 128, 129, 132, 155, 175  
 Moloney, J., 131–132  
 Muddiest Point, 35–36  
 Mueller, J., 139–140
- National rankings, 51–53, 160  
 National Survey of Student  
 Engagement (NSSE), 15, 27, 52,  
 86, 118, 169  
 Newmann, A., 46–47  
 No Child Left Behind Law, 24, 159  
 North Carolina Central University  
 (NCCU), 103–104
- The Ohio State University, 106  
 Outcomes: complexity of, 174–175;  
 departmental/program/unit,  
 105–107, 112, 124–127, 129, 130,  
 131; direct measures, 28, 66–68,  
 67e, 126; guidance for writing,  
 63–66, 64e; indirect measures,  
 68e–70, 126; institutional, 104–105,  
 111, 129–130; learning, 26–27;  
 writing, 26  
 Outcomes-oriented faculty, 62  
 Out-of-class learning, 80  
 Outside-the-classroom activities, 149
- Pascarella, E., 20–21  
 Pew Higher Education Research  
 Group, 62  
 Planning and budgeting, 56–57,  
 112–114, 113f  
 Policy Center on the First Year of  
 College, 178  
 Portfolios, 28–29, 32, 69–70, 82, 107,  
 125, 131, 173  
 Program evaluation studies, 21  
 Programmed instruction, 21–22
- Rankings, 51–53, 160  
 Regional accreditation, 156–159, 165  
 Retention, student, 21, 52  
 Rogers, J., 101
- Samson, S., 150  
 Satisfaction surveys, 1, 21, 27, 28,  
 69, 126  
 Schneider, C. G., 179  
 Schroeder, C. C., 80  
 Schuh, J., 82  
 Senior comprehensive exam, 20  
 Senior declamation, 19  
 Service-learning, 95  
 Shavelson, R., 38  
 Shulman, L., 2  
 Sloane, K., 144, 150, 151–152  
 SMART, 64e  
 Southern Association of Colleges and  
 Schools (SACS), Commission on  
 Colleges, 50, 101, 158, 162–163  
 Spellings, M., 156–157  
 Staff development, 118  
 Statewide assessment programs, 24  
 Stephens College, 69–70  
 Strom, P. S., 177

- Strom, R. D., 177
- Student affairs assessment, 82–83. *See also* Collaboration, cross-campus
- Student learning assessment, definition of, 12
- Student matriculation patterns, changing, 170–172
- Summative evaluation, 24
- Systems thinking, 21
- Teaching enhancement, 8–10
- Team-based transformative assessment, 178
- Teamwork, among students, 176–177
- Technology: databases, 112, 173; effect of changes in, 172–173; impact on learning, 2; support for faculty, 117
- Tello, S., 131–132
- Terenzini, P., 20–21
- Terosky, A. L., 46–47
- Texas Christian University, 58
- Third-party vendor, data gathering by, 15
- Time issues: in assessment implementation, 135, 136; faculty, 40–43, 116–117
- Tinto, V., 21
- Toutkoushian, R., 42
- Transformative assessment, 12–18; as appropriate, 13–14; as flexible/ongoing, 16–17, 134; for improvement and substantive change, 17–18; local institutional, 159–160; as meaningful, 14–15; need for transparency in, 160–161; pillars of, 36–38; primary purpose of, 155; principles of, 131–132; as sustainable, 15–16; teaching/learning impact on, 22, 133. *See also* Transformative assessment, future issues; Transformative assessment, history of; Transformative assessment, implementation of
- Transformative assessment, future issues, 167–180; accountability/comparability needs, 168–170; authentic measures of learning, 173–174; collaboration and teamwork, 176–178; complexity of outcomes, 174–175; intentional alignment of educational process, 175–176; student matriculation patterns, 170–172; team-based transformative assessment, 178; technological change, 172–173
- Transformative assessment, history of, 19–38; accreditation mandates, 29–30; assessment for accountability concept, 30–31; assessment for learning concept, 31–33; assessment for teaching concept, 33–36; challenges to integrating, 23–30; conceptual understanding of assessment, 25–27; precursors to assessment movement, 19–23; quality instruments, 27–29; transformative assessment, 36–38; variation in definitions, 23–25
- Transformative assessment, implementation of, 121–136; campuswide-focused model, 128–131; departmental-focused model, 123–128; models, 122–131; problems with, 132–136
- Transparency: and accreditation, 50; of assessment, 38, 45, 73; in cross-campus assessment, 105; of data collection/analysis, 102, 119, 132; in reporting process, 163–164
- Trust, 29, 36–37, 54, 62–63, 96, 143–144
- Upcraft, M. L., 82
- Washington State University assessment guide, 55–56
- Welsh, J. F., 61, 62, 72, 171
- Wiggins, G., 138
- Wilson, M., 144, 150
- Wolf, R., 39
- Wolff, R., 159–160
- Wright, B., 114
- Writing-across-the-curriculum, 118









