

**Table 1.1. Type of publications abstracted**

Unpublished Reports	70
Monograph and Book Chapters	65
Journal Articles	64
Conference Proceedings	16
Books	10
Dissertations	10
Monographs	10

**Table 1.2. Nature of Abstracted Documents**

Descriptive	146
Evaluative	38
Prescriptive	87
Conceptual	27
Empirical	58

**Table 1.3 Definitions of Conceptual Framework Dimensions**

Domains and Dimensions	Definitions
<u>External Influences</u>	
National efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>national-level activities credited with stimulating student assessment in postsecondary institutions (e.g., national reports on undergraduate education and student assessment, development of National Education Goals, revision of criteria for recognizing accrediting agencies, financial incentives or support for institutions undertaking student assessment)</li> </ul>
State-level initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>state governance structure for higher education (consolidated governing board, coordinating board with regulatory authority, coordinating board with advisory capacity, planning agency)</li> <li>form of student assessment initiative (statute, policy, combination, none)</li> <li>specific dimensions of student assessment initiatives (purpose of student assessment initiative, locus of assessment initiative decision-making, requirements for student performance indicators and assessment instruments, institutional reporting requirements for student assessment, criteria for state evaluation of institutions' student assessment activities, resources provided for student assessment)</li> </ul>
Regional accreditation association efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>student assessment-related reporting requirements (evidence of assessment plan, assessment results, intended or actual uses of assessment information)</li> <li>provision of student assessment-related services (resource materials, conferences, workshops, consultation)</li> </ul>
Private sector (business, foundations) support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inclusion of employment-related measures in student assessment approach</li> <li>provision of funds for student assessment</li> </ul>
Professional association support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provision of student assessment-related services (resource materials, conferences, workshops, consultation)</li> </ul>
<u>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</u>	
Extent by content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>extent to which institutions collect various types of student assessment data (e.g., cognitive, affective, behavioral)</li> </ul>
Timing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether student assessment data is collected from students at one or more points in time</li> </ul>
Assessment methods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>methods used to collect student assessment data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative, developed by institution or by external sources)</li> </ul>
Assessment studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nature and number of analyses conducted and reports produced of student assessment data</li> </ul>

**Table 1.3 continued**

---

Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment

Institutional support strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institutional mission emphasis (undergraduate education, intended educational outcomes, student assessment)</li><li>• purposes of student assessment (internal improvement, state or accreditation requirements)</li></ul>
Leadership and governance patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• leadership and governance activities addressing or promoting assessment</li><li>• policies, structures and processes for planning and coordinating student assessment (e.g., nature of assessment plan or policy, participants in planning process, designation of executive and operational responsibility for assessment)</li></ul>
Assessment management policies and practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• existence and extent of formally organized policies, activities and procedures intended to support the collection and use of student assessment information (e.g., resource allocation, information management, student involvement, professional development, faculty evaluation and rewards, academic planning and review)</li></ul>
Assessment culture and climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institution's purposes, values and philosophy related to student assessment</li><li>• members' perceptions and attitudes concerning institution's student assessment efforts and their role in these efforts</li></ul>
Evaluation of student assessment process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institutional evaluation of student assessment process</li></ul>

---

Institutional Context

Institutional type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institutional type (associate of arts, baccalaureate, master's, doctoral, research)</li></ul>
Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• public or private control</li></ul>
Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• institutional size (enrollment)</li></ul>

---

Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment

Use of assessment information in institutional decisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• influence of assessment information in decisions concerning strategic decisions or academic planning</li><li>• influence of assessment information in decisions concerning faculty promotion or rewards</li></ul>
Institutional impacts of student assessment information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• impact of student assessment information on faculty behavior and attitudes (e.g., interest in teaching, teaching methods used)</li><li>• impact of student assessment information on student performance (e.g., retention/graduation, grade performance)</li><li>• impact of student assessment information on institution's external relationships (e.g., student applications, state funding, institutional reputation)</li></ul>

---

**Table 2.1. Dimensions of Institutional Support for Student Assessment**

Dimension of Institutional Support	Survey Questions
<u>External Influences on Student Assessment</u>	
National efforts	IIC1a-b
State-level initiatives	IIIA1-5, IIC1c, IIC2c
Regional accreditation associations	IIB1-3, IIC2b
Private sector support	IIC1d
Professional association support	IIC2a, d
<u>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</u>	
Content	IA1-14
Timing	IA1-14
Methods	IB1-10, IC1-9, ID1-4
Assessment studies	IE1-10, IF1-6
<u>Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment</u>	
Institutional support strategy	IIA1-2, IIB1-7
Leadership and governance patterns	IIC1-7, IID1-6, IIE1-9
Assessment management policies and practices	IIVA1-4, B1-4, C1-5, D1-6, E1-4, F1-7, G1-7, H1-4
Culture and climate for student assessment	Not included in this survey
Evaluation of student assessment process	IIF1-2
<u>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</u>	
Decision making	VA1-12
Internal impacts	VB1-8
External impacts	VB9-15

**Table 2.2 Summary of Derived Variables**

<b>Derived Variable</b>	<b>Variable Name</b>	<b>Type of Variable</b>	<b>Alpha</b>	<b>Survey Items</b>
<u>External Influences on Student Assessment</u>				
no derived variables				
<u>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</u>				
Extent by Content				
academic intentions	extent1	item		IA1
postcollege assessment	postcol	factor	.83	IA11,12, 14
cognitive assessment	cognit	factor	.71	IA3-6
affective assessment	affect	factor	.68	IA7-9
academic progress	extent10	item		IA10
social roles	extent13	item		IA13
comprehensiveness of data collection	extenttt	additive index		IA1-10 (extent1-14)
Timing of data collection	timingtt	additive index		IA1-10 (time1.1-9.3)
Student assessment instruments				
number of instruments	instrtt	additive index		IB1-10
Other student assessment methods				
student-centered methods	studmeth	factor	.61	IC1-4
external methods	extmeth	factor	.63	IC8-9
transcript analysis	othmeth5	item		IC5
external examination	othmeth6	item		IC6
interviews with withdrawing students	othmeth7	item		IC7
Student assessment studies				
curricular experience studies	studcur	factor	.69	IE1-3, 8-9
co-curricular experience studies	studcoc	factor	.70	IE4-7
number of studies	studies	additive index		IE1-9
Student performance profiles or reports				
number of reports	reports	additive index		IF1-5
<u>Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment</u>				
Institutional Support Strategy				
mission emphasis	missemph	additive index		IIA1a-c
internal purposes	intpurp	factor	.79	IIB3-6
accreditation purposes	purpose1	item		IIB1
state purposes	purpose2	item		IIB2
other purposes	purpose7	item		IIB7
Leadership and Governance Patterns				
administrative and governance activities	governin	additive index		IIC1-7

**Table 2.2 continued**

Leadership and Governance Patterns				
administrative and faculty support	adminspt	additive index		IID2-5
breadth of assessment planning group	grouptot	additive index		IIE3
number approving changes	approvtot	additive index		IIE5
Assessment Management Policies and Practices				
resource allocation practices	resalloc	additive index		IVA1-4
budget decisions	budgfact	additive index		IVA3-4
computer support	infosyst	additive index		IVB2-4
access to information	accessin	additive index		IVC1-4
distribution of reports	infodist	additive index		IVD1-4
student involvement	studinv	factor	.69	IVE1, 3-4
student incentives	ive2	item		IVE2
professional development	profdev	factor	.77	IVF2-5
faculty training required	ivf1	item		IVF1
student affairs	staffrs	factor	.84	IVF6-7
faculty evaluation	faceval	factor	.77	IVG1-5
hiring process	ivg6	item		IVG6
encourage faculty	ivg7	item		IVG7
academic planning and review	planrev	factor	.84	IVH1-4
Culture and Climate for Student Assessment				
Evaluation of Student Assessment Process				
conducted evaluation	evaluate	dichotomous		IIF1a-b
<u>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</u>				
Institutional Decision Making				
academic decisions	intdec	factor	.83	VA1-5, 8-12
faculty decisions	facdec	factor	.79	VA6-7
Institutional Impacts				
faculty impacts	teachimp	factor	.79	VB1-4
student impacts	studimp	factor	.82	VB5-8
external impacts	extimp	factor	.82	VB9-15

**Table 2.3 Survey Response by Institutional Type, Control and Accrediting Region**

Classification	Number of Surveys		Response
	Sent	Received	Rate (%)
<u>Institutional Type</u>			
Research I	86	52	60
Research II	37	28	76
Doctoral I	48	27	56
Doctoral II	58	38	66
Masters' I	429	263	61
Masters' II	89	52	58
Baccalaureate I	164	72	44
Baccalaureate II	432	244	56
Associate of Arts	1022	548	54
<u>Institutional Control</u>			
Public	1439	885	62
Private	951	508	53
Unclassified <sup>a</sup>	134	69	51
<u>Accrediting Region</u>			
Middle States	403	191	47
New England	186	87	47
Northwest	140	81	58
North Central	847	528	62
Southern	746	423	57
Western	206	83	40
<u>Total</u>	2524	1393	55

<sup>a</sup>Carnegie classification was missing for 69 institutions; institutional control was missing for 23 institutions within this subset.

**Table 3.1 Extent of Student Assessment by Type of Student Assessment Data for All Respondents**

Type of Student Assessment Data Collected	Extent of Data Collection (%) <sup>a</sup>						
	N = 1393						
<u>For Currently Enrolled Students:</u>	1	2	3	4	Missing	Mean	SD
1. Student academic intentions or expectations	9.1	10.7	24.4	53.5	2.3	3.25	.98
2. Basic college-readiness skills (reading, writing, mathematics)	4.7	7.7	26.0	60.4	1.3	3.44	.83
3. Higher-order skills (critical thinking, problem solving)	39.3	24.5	17.4	16.0	2.7	2.10	1.11
4. General education competencies	28.5	17.0	21.8	30.4	2.3	2.55	1.21
5. Competence in major field of study	19.4	25.8	25.6	25.8	3.4	2.60	1.08
6. Vocational or professional skills	31.6	31.5	24.0	9.0	3.9	2.11	.97
7. Personal growth and affective development (values, attitudes, social development)	34.3	29.3	20.7	12.8	2.9	2.12	1.04
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution	16.3	27.4	35.6	17.9	2.7	2.57	.97
9. Student satisfaction with institution	3.9	21.3	46.4	25.6	2.8	2.96	.80
10. Student academic progress (retention, graduation rates)	.7	2.9	12.8	69.6	13.9	3.76	.55
<u>For Former Students:</u>							
11. Vocational or professional outcomes (career goals, job attainment or performance)	7.2	28.9	46.9	15.3	1.8	2.72	.81
12. Further education (transfer, degree attainment, graduate study)	6.7	31.4	45.9	14.4	1.6	2.69	.80
13. Civic or social roles (political, social or community involvement)	46.1	28.6	17.9	4.2	3.2	1.8	.89
14. Satisfaction and experiences with institution after leaving	8.7	33.5	41.8	14.5	1.5	2.63	.84

<sup>a</sup>1=not collected; 2 = collected for some students; 3 = collected for many students; 4 = collected for all students



**Table 3.2 Extent of Student Assessment by Institutional Type**

Type of Student Assessment Data Collected	Extent of Data Collection <sup>a</sup>					
	AA (N=545)	Bacc (N=313)	Master's (N=311)	Doctoral (N=64)	Research (N=80)	F
<u>For Currently Enrolled Students:</u>	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1. Student academic intentions or expectations	3.38 (.90)	3.33 (1.10)	2.99 (1.03)	3.05 (.97)	3.15 (.95)	9.41**
2. Basic college-readiness skills	3.56 (.59)	3.35 (.97)	3.40 (.87)	3.27 (1.01)	3.08 (1.11)	8.50**
3. Higher-order skills	1.88 (1.02)	2.41 (1.20)	2.25 (1.11)	2.05 (1.01)	1.92 (1.07)	13.67**
4. General education competencies	2.41 (1.18)	2.76 (1.22)	2.61 (1.18)	2.53 (1.21)	2.32 (1.23)	5.25**
5. Competence in major field of study	2.30 (1.07)	2.92 (1.08)	2.86 (.98)	2.70 (1.01)	2.38 (1.02)	23.97**
6. Vocational or professional skills	2.25 (1.00)	1.97 (.97)	2.00 (.89)	2.10 (.87)	1.86 (.80)	6.80**
7. Personal growth and affective development	1.77 (.91)	2.51 (1.09)	2.29 (.98)	2.27 (.98)	2.57 (.99)	36.18**
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution	2.35 (.94)	2.79 (1.01)	2.68 (.93)	2.59 (.85)	2.78 (.86)	13.55**
9. Student satisfaction with institution	2.86 (.75)	3.13 (.86)	2.97 (.79)	2.78 (.83)	2.88 (.79)	6.48**
10. Student academic progress	3.58 (.68)	3.87 (.45)	3.86 (.41)	3.83 (.38)	3.97 (.16)	22.10**
<u>For Former Students:</u>						
11. Vocational or professional outcomes	2.73 (.83)	2.74 (.78)	2.75 (.78)	2.59 (.81)	2.44 (.75)	3.06*
12. Further education	2.71 (.80)	2.74 (.78)	2.71 (.77)	2.55 (.85)	2.42 (.73)	3.24*
13. Civic or social roles	1.37 (.67)	2.26 (.91)	2.08 (.87)	2.05 (.92)	1.86 (.86)	72.77**
14. Satisfaction and experiences with institution after leaving	2.57 (.87)	2.63 (.84)	2.75 (.77)	2.63 (.75)	2.47 (.78)	3.21*

<sup>a</sup> 1=not collected; 2=collected for some students; 3=collected for many students; 4=collected for all students

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Differences across group means were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 3.3 Extent of Student Assessment by Institutional Control**

Type of Student Assessment Data Collected	Extent of Data Collection <sup>a</sup>				<i>t</i>
	Public Control (N=873)		Private Control (N=502)		
	Mean		Mean		
<u>For Currently Enrolled Students:</u>					
1. Student academic intentions or expectations	3.22	(.97)	3.31	(1.00)	-1.79
2. Basic college-readiness skills	3.54	(.68)	3.27	(1.01)	5.35**
3. Higher-order skills	1.97	(1.03)	2.34	(1.20)	-5.68**
4. General education competencies	2.46	(1.18)	2.71	(1.23)	-3.68**
5. Competence in major field of study	2.45	(1.05)	2.86	(1.09)	-6.84**
6. Vocational or professional skills	2.15	(.95)	2.03	(1.00)	2.09*
7. Personal growth and affective development	1.87	(.92)	2.56	(1.10)	-11.68**
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution	2.40	(.93)	2.86	(.98)	-8.43**
9. Student satisfaction with institution	2.87	(.75)	3.13	(.85)	-5.69**
10. Student academic progress	3.70	(.59)	3.86	(.46)	-5.33**
<u>For Former Students:</u>					
11. Vocational or professional outcomes	2.71	(.80)	2.72	(.83)	-.18
12. Further education	2.66	(.80)	2.75	(.80)	-2.06*
13. Civic or social roles	1.55	(.78)	2.61	(.91)	-14.17**
14. Satisfaction and experiences with institution after leaving	2.61	(.83)	2.66	(.85)	-.96

<sup>a</sup> 1=not collected; 2=collected for some students; 3=collected for many students; 4=collected for all students

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Means were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 3.4 Timing of Student Assessment by Type of Student Assessment Data for All Respondents**

Type of Student Assessment Data Collected	Timing of Data Collection (% of institutions) (N = 1393)					
	Not collected	Collected at entry	Collected while enrolled	Collected at exit	Collected twice <sup>a</sup>	Missing
For Currently Enrolled Students:						
1. Student academic intentions or expectations	9.1	81.0	31.8	17.0	25.0	2.4
2. Basic college-readiness skills (reading, writing, mathematics)	4.7	90.2	19.9	7.1	16.3	1.8
3. Higher-order skills (critical thinking, problem solving)	39.3	18.3	38.3	57.9	13.0	2.8
4. General education competencies	28.5	22.1	44.1	24.9	15.9	2.4
5. Competence in major field of study	19.4	7.1	47.5	49.6	22.7	3.6
6. Vocational or professional skills	31.6	6.7	42.9	38.1	20.6	4.5
7. Personal growth and affective development (values, attitudes, social development)	34.3	20.3	42.3	25.9	15.2	2.7
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution	16.3	5.6	56.9	43.4	20.3	4.3
9. Student satisfaction with institution	3.9	6.0	65.0	59.2	31.2	4.4

<sup>a</sup>collected at entry and while enrolled, at entry and exit, or while enrolled and at exit

**Table 3.5 Source of Student Assessment Instruments by Type of Student Assessment Data for All Respondents**

Type of Student Assessment Data	% Institutions Using Instruments from Various Sources <sup>a</sup> (N=1393)				
	Not used	Institutionally developed	State provided	Commercially available	Missing
1. Student academic intentions or expectations	20.5	51.0	4.2	31.7	2.9
2. Basic college-readiness skills (reading, writing, mathematics)	6.3	37.6	10.8	67.1	.9
3. Higher-order skills (critical thinking, problem solving)	42.2	29.1	2.2	32.0	2.7
4. General education competencies	31.8	40.1	5.2	32.8	2.2
5. Competence in major field of study	19.4	64.3	12.4	39.3	1.9
6. Vocational or professional skills	33.5	42.6	14.4	24.7	3.9
7. Personal growth and affective development (values, attitudes, social development)	37.5	39.2	2.3	29.6	2.9
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution	20.6	60.0	3.7	24.2	3.5
9. Student satisfaction with institution	3.8	72.9	8.2	34.7	1.4
10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences	9.6	77.7	7.8	15.0	1.9

<sup>a</sup>Institutions could select more than one source of instrument for each content area

**Table 3.6 Source of Student Assessment Instruments Used by Type of Data and Institutional Type**

Type of Student Assessment Data and Source of Instrument	Source Used by Institutional Type (% of Institutions) <sup>a</sup>					
	Assoc of Arts (N=548)	Bacc- alaureate (N=316)	Master's (N=315)	Doctoral (N=65)	Research (N=80)	Chi-square
1. Student academic intentions or expectations						
Not used	17.9	21.0	23.3	28.3	20.3	6.1
Institutionally developed	60.1	46.0	46.0	45.0	53.2	24.3 **
State provided	7.6	.3	3.0	3.3	2.5	28.5 **
Commercially available	23.8	41.7	38.7	45.0	44.3	43.0 **
Missing	2.0	2.2	4.8	7.7	1.3	
2. Basic college-readiness skills						
Not used	1.1	11.5	4.8	12.9	22.8	81.1 **
Institutionally developed	20.7	49.8	53.0	58.1	46.8	129.6 **
State provided	13.9	3.2	11.8	16.1	11.4	26.5 **
Commercially available	84.8	57.8	58.8	38.7	45.6	139.3 **
Missing	.5	.9	.6	4.6	1.3	
3. Higher-order skills						
Not used	51.1	39.0	34.2	35.4	51.3	29.6 **
Institutionally developed	25.9	29.9	32.9	44.6	28.9	12.1 *
State provided	2.1	1.9	1.6	3.1	2.6	.8
Commercially available	26.9	37.3	42.3	36.9	27.6	24.8 **
Missing	2.9	2.5	2.5	---	5.0	
4. General education competencies						
Not used	34.8	27.5	31.3	33.8	45.5	10.8 *
Institutionally developed	38.3	45.0	41.9	46.2	35.1	5.5
State provided	5.3	3.6	5.2	6.2	6.5	2.0
Commercially available	33.3	36.6	34.5	27.7	22.1	7.0
Missing	2.9	2.2	1.6	---	3.8	
5. Competence in major field of study						
Not used	29.9	11.2	8.4	14.1	27.3	79.0 **
Institutionally developed	55.2	74.1	76.0	76.6	62.3	54.4 **
State provided	14.4	9.3	15.9	12.5	2.6	14.6 **
Commercially available	25.9	50.5	56.8	43.8	35.1	95.3 **
Missing	2.2	.9	2.2	1.5	3.8	

**Table 3.6 continued**

6. Vocational or professional skills							
Not used	28.8	43.0	36.5	37.1	44.6	20.8	**
Institutionally developed	50.4	33.4	43.2	46.8	41.9	22.9	**
State provided	14.0	14.9	18.9	14.5	5.4	9.4	
Commercially available	24.7	23.2	29.2	32.3	25.7	4.6	
Missing	2.6	4.4	4.4	4.6	7.5		
7. Personal growth and affective development							
Not used	53.5	26.7	28.6	26.2	21.1	95.4	**
Institutionally developed	29.0	47.6	45.7	56.9	56.6	54.8	**
State provided	2.4	1.6	2.6	3.1	2.6	1.0	
Commercially available	21.3	41.0	38.5	35.4	34.2	46.3	**
Missing	2.4	2.8	3.5	---	5.0		
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution							
Not used	29.3	15.6	12.9	18.8	10.5	45.0	**
Institutionally developed	57.0	65.8	66.0	65.6	71.1	12.4	*
State provided	5.1	1.3	4.3	7.8	3.9	9.9	*
Commercially available	17.1	35.2	30.7	26.6	30.3	39.3	**
Missing	4.0	2.8	3.8	1.5	5.0		
9. Student satisfaction with institution							
Not used	3.9	5.8	2.9	6.2	---	7.7	
Institutionally developed	75.0	71.7	70.6	73.8	77.2	2.9	
State provided	11.5	2.9	8.7	10.8	8.9	19.0	**
Commercially available	27.6	43.4	43.9	40.0	32.9	33.0	**
Missing	1.5	1.6	1.6	---	1.3		
10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences							
Not used	15.5	7.1	4.2	3.2	6.4	38.1	**
Institutionally developed	72.9	81.4	85.8	84.1	84.6	24.4	**
State provided	12.1	1.3	8.7	6.3	9.0	31.1	**
Commercially available	9.3	22.5	17.7	28.6	14.1	36.2	**
Missing	2.4	1.6	1.6	3.1	2.5		

<sup>a</sup>Institutions could select more than one source of instrument for each content area.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 3.7 Source of Student Assessment Instruments Used by Type of Data and Institutional Control**

Type of Student Performance Data and Source of Instrument	Source of Instrument Used by Institutional Control (% of Institutions) <sup>a</sup>			Chi- Square	
	Public (N=885)	Private (N=508)			
1. Student academic intentions or expectations					
Not used	21.3	20.9	.02		
Institutionally developed	55.3	47.8	7.2	**	
State provided	6.7	.2	32.1	**	
Commercially available	28.0	40.7	22.7	**	
Missing	2.8	3.1			
2. Basic college-readiness skills					
Not used	3.0	12.3	47.0	**	
Institutionally developed	30.0	51.9	65.3	**	
State provided	15.8	2.2	61.5	**	
Commercially available	74.5	55.9	50.7	**	
Missing	.8	1.0			
3. Higher-order skills					
Not used	45.8	39.1	5.7	*	
Institutionally developed	29.2	31.2	.6		
State provided	2.7	1.4	2.3		
Commercially available	30.9	36.5	4.5	*	
Missing	2.6	3.0			
4. General education competencies					
Not used	33.5	30.8	1.1		
Institutionally developed	39.3	43.9	2.8		
State provided	6.6	3.0	7.8	**	
Commercially available	33.6	33.4	.01		
Missing	1.9	2.8			
5. Competence in major field of study					
Not used	22.4	15.2	10.1	**	
Institutionally developed	63.2	69.5	5.6	*	
State provided	14.3	9.8	5.7	*	
Commercially available	36.5	46.3	12.6	**	
Missing	1.9	1.8			

**Table 3.7 continued**

6. Vocational or professional skills				
Not used	31.1	41.7	15.2	**
Institutionally developed	48.5	36.9	17.0	**
State provided	15.4	14.4	.2	
Commercially available	27.4	22.7	3.5	
Missing	2.9	5.5		
7. Personal growth and affective development				
Not used	46.0	25.6	55.1	**
Institutionally developed	35.3	49.2	24.9	**
State provided	3.4	.6	10.3	**
Commercially available	24.5	40.9	39.3	**
Missing	2.8	3.1		
8. Student experiences and involvement with institution				
Not used	25.7	13.8	26.5	**
Institutionally developed	58.8	68.2	11.7	**
State provided	5.8	.6	22.3	**
Commercially available	20.2	33.5	29.2	**
Missing	3.8	3.0		
9. Student satisfaction with institution				
Not used	3.0	5.4	5.0	*
Institutionally developed	74.9	72.2	1.2	
State provided	12.6	.8	58.1	**
Commercially available	30.8	43.0	20.8	**
Missing	1.2	1.6		
10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences				
Not used	11.4	7.0	6.9	**
Institutionally developed	77.1	83.1	7.1	**
State provided	12.4	.2	64.6	**
Commercially available	13.2	18.9	7.7	**
Missing	1.9	2.0		

<sup>a</sup>Institutions could select more than one source of instrument for each content area.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$



**Table 3.8 Extent of Use of Other Student Assessment Methods for All Respondents**

Other Student Assessment Methods	Extent of Use <sup>a</sup> by All Institutions (% of Institutions) (N=1393)						
	1	2	3	4	Missing	Mean	SD
1. Observations of student performance	8.2	62.7	21.2	6.1	1.8	2.26	.69
2. Student portfolios or comprehensive projects	6.5	79.0	10.1	3.4	1.0	2.10	.54
3. Student performance in capstone courses	18.2	54.6	17.4	7.5	2.4	2.15	.81
4. Student interviews or focus groups	23.8	67.6	5.6	1.4	1.7	1.84	.57
5. Transcript analysis	35.5	30.5	10.6	20.4	3.1	2.16	1.14
6. External examination of students	8.9	80.8	6.7	2.1	1.4	2.02	.49
7. Surveys or interviews with withdrawing students	16.8	46.2	14.7	20.5	1.7	2.40	1.00
8. Alumni interviews or focus groups	30.0	54.1	8.1	6.0	1.8	1.90	.79
9. Employer interviews or focus groups	27.4	59.7	7.5	3.7	1.7	1.87	.70

<sup>a</sup> 1=not used; 2=used in some units; 3=used in most units; 4=used in all units

**Table 3.9 Extent of Use of Other Student Assessment Methods by Institutional Type**

Other Student Assessment Methods	Extent of Use by Institutional Type (% of Institutions) <sup>a</sup>					F
	Assoc of Arts (N=539)	Baccalaureate (N=315)	Master's (N=314)	Doctoral (N=65)	Research (N=78)	
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
1. Observations of student performance	2.22 (.72)	2.34 (.70)	2.24 (.59)	2.26 (.62)	2.00 (.53)	4.40**
2. Student portfolios or comprehensive projects	1.95 (.46)	2.29 (.65)	2.18 (.50)	2.25 (.56)	2.04 (.38)	24.77**
3. Student performance in capstone courses	1.78 (.71)	2.50 (.84)	2.41 (.71)	2.47 (.82)	2.11 (.53)	62.75**
4. Student interviews or focus groups	1.65 (.54)	1.96 (.64)	1.98 (.47)	2.06 (.43)	1.92 (.42)	30.04**
5. Transcript analysis	2.19 (1.15)	2.24 (1.18)	2.13 (1.11)	1.94 (1.04)	1.19 (.94)	2.11
6. External examination of students	2.01 (.43)	1.98 (.56)	2.08 (.46)	2.18 (.56)	1.88 (.53)	4.99**
7. Surveys or interviews with withdrawing students	2.26 (.99)	2.78 (1.03)	2.35 (.95)	2.31 (.96)	2.08 (.70)	17.25**
8. Alumni interviews or focus groups	1.80 (.81)	1.95 (.78)	2.03 (.76)	1.95 (.72)	1.96 (.80)	4.73**
9. Employer interviews or focus groups	1.98 (.75)	1.66 (.65)	1.87 (.58)	1.86 (.66)	1.82 (.66)	10.88**

<sup>a</sup> 1=not used; 2=used in some units; 3=used in most units; 4=used in all units

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 3.10 Extent of Use of Other Student Assessment Methods by Institutional Control**

Other Student Assessment Methods	Extent of Use by Control <sup>a</sup> (% of Institutions)		
	Public (N=875)	Private (N=504)	<i>t</i>
1. Observations of student performance	2.21 (.69)	2.34 (.70)	-3.39**
2. Student portfolios or comprehensive projects	2.00 (.46)	2.28 (.63)	-8.54
3. Student performance in capstone courses	1.97 (.72)	2.46 (.85)	-10.93**
4. Student interviews or focus groups	1.77 (.53)	1.97 (.62)	-5.93**
5. Transcript analysis	2.12 (1.10)	2.24 (1.19)	-1.78
6. External examination of students	2.06 (.44)	1.95 (.57)	3.77**
7. Surveys or interviews with withdrawing students	2.21 (.93)	2.72 (1.04)	-9.22**
8. Alumni interviews or focus groups	1.88 (.80)	1.93 (.77)	-1.22
9. Employer interviews or focus groups	1.97 (.69)	1.71 (.68)	6.79**

<sup>a</sup> 1=not used; 2=used in some units; 3=used in most units; 4=used in all units.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Group means were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 3.11 Use of Different Student Assessment Methods for Special Student Populations by Institutional Type and Control**

Student Population	Institutions (%) Using Different Student Assessment Methods for Special Student Populations									
	All N=1366	Institutional Type (N=1305)						Institutional Control (N=1366)		
		Assoc. of Arts N=545	Bacca- laureate N=306	Master's N=311	Doctoral N=64	Research N=79	F	Public N=874	Private N=492	<i>t</i>
1. Adult students	9.6	2.8	17.3	16.1	3.1	8.1	68.1**	3.4	20.6	106.0**
2. Part-time students	4.9	3.0	7.3	4.8	3.2	6.7	9.4	3.7	7.2	8.4**
3. Minority students	2.2	1.8	1.0	3.2	3.1	3.8	5.3	2.5	1.6	1.2
4. Distance education students	21.5	20.9	21.8	25.1	15.8	26.7	3.7	19.7	27.1	6.4**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Differences in group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Differences in group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 3.12 Student Assessment Studies Conducted by All Institutions and by Institutional Type and Control**

Studies of Relationship Between Student Performance and the Following Experiences	Institutions (%) Conducting Studies									
	All N=1329	Institutional Type N=1264					Institutional Control N=1329			
		Assoc. of Arts N=519	Bacca- laureate N=304	Master's N=302	Doctoral N=64	Research N=75	Chi-Square	Public N=845	Private N=484	Chi-Square
1. Student course-taking patterns	25.6	26.0	22.7	24.2	34.4	41.3	13.7**	28.2	21.1	8.2**
2. Exposure to different instructional or teaching methods	21.4	25.0	16.1	18.9	25.0	24.0	11.1*	23.1	18.6	3.7
3. Patterns of student-faculty interaction	14.1	10.6	16.1	13.2	20.3	29.3	22.8**	13.1	15.9	1.9
4. Extra-curricular activities	23.8	14.5	30.3	30.1	37.5	36.0	50.3**	20.0	30.4	18.3**
5. Residence arrangements	21.2	6.0	26.6	32.1	40.6	53.3	156.6**	16.4	29.5	31.6**
6. Student financial aid and/or concurrent employment	29.7	27.2	27.0	30.5	37.5	49.3	18.5**	29.6	30.0	.02
7. Admission standards or policies	42.1	27.4	49.7	51.7	56.3	64.0	84.7**	38.0	49.2	15.8**
8. Academic advising patterns	25.9	23.9	26.6	28.8	25.0	26.7	2.6	25.3	26.9	.4
9. Classroom, library and/or computing resources	16.6	19.1	16.8	14.2	15.6	9.3	6.4	16.3	17.1	.1
10. Do not study the relationship between the above experiences and student performance	37.5	44.7	34.2	34.8	28.1	16.0	31.1**	39.8	33.7	4.9*

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 3.13 Student Performance Reports Provided by Institutional Type and Control**

Levels of Aggregation of Student Performance Reports	Institutions (%) Providing Reports									
	All N=1363	Institutional Type N=1296						Institutional Control N=1363		
		Assoc. of Arts N=539	Bacca- laureate N=309	Master's N=305	Doctoral N=65	Research N=78	Chi-Square	Public N=885	Private N=508	Chi-Square
1. Institution wide	69.2	66.4	68.9	73.8	72.3	73.1	5.8	71.6	65.0	6.4*
2. Schools or colleges	30.6	13.0	19.1	54.4	67.7	76.9	299.4**	32.2	27.7	3.0
3. Academic programs or departments	65.3	60.7	64.1	76.1	69.2	66.7	21.4**	66.9	62.5	2.6
4. Special populations or subgroups of students	45.7	45.6	36.6	50.8	50.8	65.4	26.3**	49.8	38.5	16.1**
5. By course or groups of courses	35.9	45.6	29.4	27.2	33.8	30.8	38.8**	40.9	26.9	27.0**
6. Do not provide any reports	10.9	13.4	9.4	7.2	7.7	10.3	9.2	9.9	12.6	2.5

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.1 Development of and Influence of Requirements for State Assessment Plans by Institutional Type and Control**

Development of State Assessment Plan <sup>a</sup>	Institutions (%) Reporting									
	Institutional Type N=911							Institutional Control N=963		
State assessment plan or requirement was primarily developed:	All N=963	Associate of Arts N=493	Bacca- laureate N=99	Master's N=214	Doctoral N=45	Research N=60		Public N=845	Private N=118	
1. By state-level officials	15.5	17.4	5.1	16.4	15.6	11.7		17.2	3.4	
2. Through joint consultation between state officials and institutional representatives	38.5	44.8	24.2	32.2	28.9	41.7		43.1	5.9	
3. No statewide plan or requirement for student assessment exists	46.0	37.7	70.7	51.4	55.6	46.7		39.8	90.7	
	Chi-Square 45.36**							Chi-Square 101.12**		
Influence of State Assessment Plan <sup>b</sup>	Institutional Type N=593							Institutional Control N=625		
State requirements for student assessment:	All N=625	Associate of Arts N=343	Bacca- laureate N=43	Master's N=83	Doctoral N=17	Research N=21	Chi- Square	Public N=588	Private N=37	Chi- Square
1. Were an important reason for institution initiating student assessment	45.1	48.4	30.2	40.7	43.3	43.2	6.49	47.3	10.8	18.70**
2. Have increased institution's involvement in student assessment	62.4	69.4	41.9	55.7	53.3	67.6	19.01**	65.0	21.6	27.87**
3. Have not been a factor in institution's student assessment activities	21.6	14.9	46.5	30.0	33.3	13.5	34.65**	18.4	73.0	61.29**
4. Have been a negative influence on institution's student assessment activities	4.0	3.5	--	6.4	3.3	8.1	5.47	4.3	--	1.64

<sup>a</sup> Only institutions receiving state funding responded to this question.

<sup>b</sup> Only institutions reporting the existence of a state requirement or plan for student assessment responded to this question.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.2 State Reporting Requirements by Institutional Type and Control**

State reporting requirements for student assessment include	Institutions (%) Reporting <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=562	Institutional Type N=532						Institutional Control N=562		
		Associate of Arts N=324	Bacca- laureate N=34	Master's N=117	Doctoral N=24	Research N=33	Chi- Square	Public N=546	Private N=16	Chi- Square
1. Evidence that a student assessment plan is in place	67.8	69.4	88.2	63.2	66.7	57.6	9.62*	67.8	68.8	.01
2. Measurement of state-mandated student performance indicators	64.2	66.4	55.9	65.8	70.8	51.5	4.52	65.0	37.5	5.12*
3. Use of institutionally-devised student performance indicators	49.1	47.5	58.8	49.6	41.7	75.8	11.27*	49.5	37.5	.89
4. Evidence of institutional use of student assessment information	51.8	53.4	73.5	47.9	25.0	48.5	14.54**	52.0	43.8	.43

<sup>a</sup> Only institutions that receive state funding and reported the existence of a state requirement or plan for student assessment responded to this question.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$



**Table 4.3 State Review of Student Assessment Plans or Process by Institutional Type and Control**

Review of Student Assessment Plan or Process	Institutions (%) Reporting <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=605	Institutional Type N=572						Institutional Control N=605		
		Associate of Arts N=335	Bacca- laureate N=40	Master's N=131	Doctoral N=30	Research N=36	Chi- Square	Public N=574	Private N=31	Chi- Square
After implementation, institution's student assessment plan or process:										
1. Was reviewed by state-level officials	42.1	46.0	45.0	35.9	30.0	44.4	6.07	44.1	6.5	17.08**
2. Was reviewed by external reviewers	16.2	20.3	7.5	11.5	20.0	8.3	10.24*	16.9	3.2	4.05*
3. Required an institutional self-review	24.3	27.8	22.5	16.8	16.7	16.7	8.37	25.1	9.7	3.80
4. Has not been reviewed	44.1	36.4	50.0	54.2	56.7	55.6	17.84**	41.6	90.3	28.27**
Criteria Used in State Review <sup>b</sup>										
	All N=372	Institutional Type N=353						Institutional Control N=372		
State review of institution's student assessment plan or process included:		Associate of Arts N=237	Bacca- laureate N=21	Master's N=60	Doctoral N=14	Research N=21	Chi- Square	Public N=366	Private N=6	Chi- Square
1. Review of institution's student assessment process itself	67.2	48.4	76.2	70.0	64.3	66.7	.95	67.2	66.7	.01
2. Comparison of institution's student performance record with past performance	44.4	40.9	42.9	51.7	64.3	42.9	4.7	44.8	16.7	1.89
3. Comparison of institution's student performance record with peer institutions	35.8	37.6	14.3	35.0	35.7	33.3	4.62	36.3	--	3.39
4. Comparison of institution's student performance record with other institutions in same state	38.2	35.9	28.6	38.3	71.4	42.9	8.12	38.5	16.7	1.20
5. Other	9.9	10.1	23.8	6.7	--	9.5	6.8	9.0	66.7	21.9**

<sup>a</sup> Only institutions that receive state funding and reported the existence of a state requirement or plan for student assessment responded to this question

<sup>b</sup> Only institutions that reported a post hoc review of their student assessment plan or process responded to this question

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.4 Regional Accreditation Review and Influence by Institutional Type and Control**

	Institutions (%) Reporting									
		Institutional Type N=1304						Institutional Control N=1372		
Experience with regional accreditation review:	All N=1372	Associate of Arts N=539	Bacca- laureate N=312	Master's N=311	Doctoral N=64	Research N=78	Chi- Square	Public N=870	Private N=502	Chi- Square
Institution has completed a regional accreditation review which required student assessment	80.3	79.6	81.4	82.3	82.8	73.1	4.05	80.8	79.5	.35
		Institutional Type N=1294						Institutional Control N=1359		
Regional accreditation requirements for student assessment:	All N=1359	Associate of Arts N=533	Bacca- laureate N=308	Master's N=312	Doctoral N=63	Research N=78	Chi- Square	Public N=862	Private N=497	Chi- Square
1. Were an important reason for institution initiating student assessment	63.6	61.9	64.9	72.1	61.9	39.7	29.96**	61.4	67.4	4.96*
2. Have increased institution's involvement in student assessment	79.2	75.4	84.4	85.3	84.1	70.5	21.23**	76.5	84.1	11.23**
3. Have not been a factor in institution's student assessment activities	12.4	14.6	7.5	8.0	11.1	24.4	25.92**	14.5	8.9	9.24**
4. Have been a negative influence on institution's student assessment activities	.9	.8	.3	1.9	--	1.3	5.46	1.0	.6	.70

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.5 Regional Accreditation Reporting Requirements by Institutional Type and Control**

Regional accreditation reporting requirements for student assessment include:	Institutions (%) Reporting									
	All N=1352	Institutional Type N=1287						Institutional Control N=1352		
		Associate of Arts N=528	Bacca- laureate N=308	Master's N=310	Doctoral N=65	Research N=76	Chi- Square	Public N=857	Private N=495	Chi- Square
1. Evidence that a student assessment plan is in place	90.2	89.2	91.9	94.2	90.8	76.3	24.09**	89.3	91.7	2.13
2. Intended institutional uses of student assessment information	72.7	72.2	74.7	75.5	78.5	59.2	9.93*	72.0	73.9	.60
3. Results of student assessment	66.1	66.3	66.2	69.4	64.6	56.6	4.59	66.0	66.3	.01
4. Evidence of actual institutional use of student assessment information	77.4	78.4	79.2	80.0	70.8	68.4	7.09	77.0	78.2	.25
5. Unfamiliar with regional accreditation requirements for student assessment	4.6	4.4	3.6	3.5	3.1	13.2	15.07**	7.0	2.7	1.61

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.6 Receipt of External Grants for Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Received grant to improve student assessment practices from:	Institutions (%) Reporting									
	All N=1283	Institutional Type N=1220						Institutional Control N=1283		
		Associate of Arts N=508	Bacca- laureate N=291	Master's N=290	Doctoral N=59	Research N=72	Chi- Square	Public N=825	Private N=458	Chi- Square
1. FIPSE	5.9	2.2	7.6	9.0	10.2	9.7	22.94**	5.3	7.0	1.45
2. Other federal agencies	6.6	10.4	4.8	2.8	8.5	2.8	22.20**	8.0	4.1	7.06**
3. State incentive program	7.0	7.9	3.4	10.0	3.4	9.7	11.86*	10.3	1.1	38.31**
4. Private foundations or corporate sources	5.8	1.8	11.0	5.5	8.5	12.5	36.09**	3.4	10.0	23.96**
5. No external grants received	79.0	80.5	79.0	77.2	76.3	72.2	3.39	77.3	81.9	3.66

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 4.7 Use of External Resources for Student Assessment by Type of Provider**

	Institutions (%) Reporting Use					
	Type of Student Assessment Service					
Type of postsecondary organization providing service	Services not used or not available	Consultation services	Assessment conferences	Training workshops	Publications or research reports	% institutions using services from this provider
Professional associations	29.4	13.3	50.7	32.0	51.4	62.1
Regional accrediting association	29.8	18.7	40.9	31.9	45.0	60.7
State-level agency	53.5	13.6	26.4	22.3	22.3	33.4
Consortium of institutions	53.1	12.5	30.2	17.9	20.2	34.1
% institutions using each type of service	26.3	32.9	66.5	51.8	59.8	

**Table 5.1 Institutional Mission Emphasis by Institutional Type and Control**

Institutional Mission Statement Explicitly	Institutional Mission Statement Emphases (% in Institutions)									
	All N=1376	Institutional Type N=1309						Institutional Control N=1376		
		Assoc of Arts N=539	Bacca- laureate N=315	Master's N=313	Doctoral N=64	Research N=78	Chi- Square	Public N=873	Private N=503	Chi- Square
1. Emphasizes excellence in undergraduate education	81.9	75.3	87.6	88.8	87.5	84.6	35.2**	78.9	87.1	14.3**
2. Identifies intended educational outcomes for students	52.0	49.7	61.0	53.4	42.2	33.3	24.8**	46.6	61.4	28.0**
3. Refers to student assessment as important institutional activity	19.3	21.3	15.6	21.7	20.3	9.0	10.9*	22.5	13.7	15.7**
4. Does not explicitly mention any of above emphases	10.8	14.1	6.7	7.0	9.4	12.8	17.1**	12.9	7.0	11.9**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.2 Purpose of Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Institutional Purpose of Student Assessment	Importance of Institutional Purpose <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1379	Institutional Type N=1311						Institutional Control N=1379		
		Associate of Arts N=544	Bacca- laureate N=312	Master's N=312	Doctoral N=65	Research N=78	F	Public N=875	Private N=504	<i>t</i>
1. Preparing institutional self-study for accreditation	3.86 (.65)	3.61 (.66)	3.63 (.63)	3.67 (.55)	3.69 (.58)	3.14 (.92)	11.3**	3.59 (.67)	3.64 (.63)	-1.3
2. Meeting state reporting requirements	2.89 (1.18)	3.37 (.90)	2.30 (1.21)	2.76 (1.17)	2.60 (1.26)	2.41 (1.27)	54.7**	3.29 (.95)	2.17 (1.19)	17.9**
3. Guiding internal resource allocation decisions	2.71 (.91)	2.83 (.89)	2.62 (.92)	2.62 (.86)	2.51 (.90)	2.40 (.89)	6.96**	2.74 (.89)	2.66 (.93)	1.55
4. Guiding undergraduate academic program improvement	3.43 (.72)	3.38 (.75)	3.51 (.70)	3.46 (.67)	3.28 (.74)	3.29 (.75)	3.25*	3.38 (.73)	3.51 (.68)	-3.26**
5. Improving the achievement of undergraduate students	3.48 (.71)	3.50 (.70)	3.47 (.73)	3.50 (.65)	3.40 (.77)	3.17 (.80)	3.97**	3.45 (.72)	3.53 (.69)	-2.05*
6. Improving faculty instructional performance	3.02 (.82)	3.06 (.90)	3.08 (.88)	2.95 (.87)	2.82 (.93)	2.62 (.92)	5.53**	2.98 (.92)	3.10 (.85)	-2.45*

<sup>a</sup> 1=no importance; 2=minor importance; 3=moderate importance; 4=very important

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 5.3 Engagement in Administrative and Governance Activities Promoting Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Administrative and Governance Activities That Promote Student Assessment	Institutions (%) Engaging in Activities									
	All N=1097	Institutional Type N=1044						Institutional Control N=1097		
		Assoc of Arts N=428	Bacca-laureate N=254	Master's N=261	Doctoral N=50	Research N=51	Chi-Square	Public N=701	Private N=396	Chi-Square
1. Annual presidential or institution-wide student assessment initiatives or forums	41.3	48.1	32.7	41.0	34.0	27.5	21.2**	44.4	35.9	7.6**
2. Rewards or incentives for academic and student affairs administrators who promote unit use of assessment	6.4	3.7	5.9	7.3	18.0	17.6	27.0**	5.7	7.6	1.5
3. Incentives for academic units to use assessment information in evaluation and improvement efforts	26.6	23.6	25.2	30.7	38.0	29.4	7.9	29.0	22.5	5.4*
4. Assessment workshops for academic and student affairs administrators	56.4	56.5	48.8	61.3	52.0	66.7	11.0*	57.5	54.5	.9
5. Board of trustees committee that addresses assessment	12.8	10.3	13.8	16.9	10.0	9.8	7.3	12.3	13.6	.4
6. Faculty governance committee that addresses assessment issues	57.8	49.5	68.9	63.6	54.0	37.3	37.4**	52.1	67.9	26.1**
7. Student representation on assessment committees	33.4	28.0	37.4	41.0	36.0	27.5	14.9**	32.5	34.8	.6

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$



**Table 5.4 Constituent Support for Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Internal Constituent Group	Extent to Which Group Supports Student Assessment <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1370	Institutional Type N=1304						Institutional Control N=1370		
		Associate of Arts N=538	Bacca- laureate N=313	Master's N=311	Doctoral N=65	Research N=77	F	Public N=870	Private N=500	<i>t</i>
1. Board of trustees	3.84 (.93)	3.87 (.95)	3.79 (.94)	3.90 (.90)	3.68 (.91)	3.67 (.86)	1.66	3.87 (.93)	3.81 (.93)	1.12
2. Chief executive officer	4.41 (.84)	4.47 (.84)	4.39 (.91)	4.42 (.78)	4.30 (.87)	4.16 (.77)	2.78*	4.44 (.82)	4.38 (.87)	1.34
3. Academic affairs administrators	4.64 (.69)	4.64 (.71)	4.69 (.71)	4.68 (.60)	4.53 (.76)	4.35 (.66)	4.41**	4.62 (.68)	4.67 (.70)	-1.18
4. Student affairs administrators	4.33 (.83)	4.38 (.87)	4.33 (.85)	4.27 (.78)	4.30 (.87)	4.29 (.76)	.88	4.35 (.83)	4.33 (.84)	.46
5. Faculty governance	3.80 (.93)	3.87 (.94)	3.83 (.90)	3.77 (.92)	3.58 (.98)	3.45 (.85)	4.49**	3.77 (.94)	3.90 (.89)	-2.47*
6. Students	3.33 (.74)	3.40 (.76)	3.33 (.80)	3.24 (.67)	3.27 (.74)	3.22 (.63)	2.92*	3.35 (.74)	3.33 (.78)	.47

<sup>a</sup> 1=very unsupportive; 2=somewhat unsupportive; 3=neutral, unknown; 4=somewhat supportive; 5=very supportive

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 5.5 Institutions with Plan or Policy for Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Institutional Plan or Policy for Student Assessment <sup>a</sup>	All N=1381	Institutional Type N=1312						Institutional Control N=1381		
		Assoc of Arts N=543	Bacca- laureate N=314	Master's N=311	Doctoral N=65	Research N=79	Chi-Square	Public N=876	Private N=505	Chi-Square
1. Formal centralization: a plan or policy requiring specified undergraduate student assessment activities of all academic units or programs	50.0	53.8	54.8	46.6	36.9	27.8	27.33**	50.9	48.3	.86
2. Formal limited centralization: a plan or policy for undergraduate student assessment in some academic units or program areas	18.7	19.5	14.3	20.9	21.5	15.2	6.17	18.7	18.6	.01
3. Formal decentralization: a plan or policy requiring all academic units or programs to develop their own undergraduate student assessment plan	39.2	23.9	46.2	58.5	56.9	41.8	115.48**	35.6	45.5	13.24**
4. Formal guidance: a plan or policy stipulating institution-wide activities to be conducted by central committee or office	38.2	37.8	39.8	39.9	43.1	29.1	4.12	38.0	38.6	.05
5. Informal: no plan or policy but academic units or programs are encouraged to conduct their own undergraduate student assessment activities	13.0	10.1	14.3	14.8	7.7	25.3	17.51**	12.1	14.5	1.58
6. Emergent: currently developing a plan or policy for undergraduate student assessment	16.6	14.0	16.9	21.2	12.3	12.7	9.27	15.0	19.4	4.59*
7. None: does not have an undergraduate student assessment plan or policy	4.1	4.4	2.2	1.9	1.5	19.0	53.01**	4.6	3.4	1.17

<sup>a</sup>Institutions could select more than one type of plan or policy

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.6 Existence of and Membership on Institution-Wide Student Assessment Planning Group by Institutional Type and Control**

	Institutions (%) Reporting									
	Institutional Type N=1269							Institutional Control N=1336		
Existence of Assessment Planning Group	All N=1336	Assoc of Arts N=24	Bacca- laureate N=306	Master's N=305	Doctoral N=65	Research N=69	Chi-Square	Public N=940	Private N=396	Chi-Square
1. Has institution-wide planning group for undergraduate student assessment	70.4	72.7	72.5	72.8	61.5	44.9	26.9**	69.2	72.4	1.5
Membership on Student Assessment Planning Group <sup>a</sup>	All N=943	Assoc of Arts N=378	Bacca- laureate N=223	Master's N=226	Doctoral N=40	Research N=32	Chi-Square	Public N=585	Private N=358	Chi-Square
1. Chief executive officer	13.0	16.9	11.7	7.1	2.5	3.1	19.70**	12.8	13.4	.07
2. Academic affairs administrator or staff	85.8	86.0	84.8	87.2	82.5	87.5	.99	85.5	86.3	.13
3. Student affairs administrator or staff	54.3	66.9	39.9	46.9	50.0	50.0	48.28**	61.4	42.7	31.06**
4. Institutional research administrator or staff	60.7	67.2	52.9	59.3	60.0	62.5	12.56*	66.2	51.7	19.51**
5. Academic review and evaluation administrator or staff	23.5	23.8	20.2	21.7	30.0	34.4	4.80	24.8	21.5	1.33
6. Student assessment administrator or staff	32.3	36.5	22.4	32.3	37.5	50.0	18.03**	38.3	22.6	24.91**
7. Faculty	90.9	91.3	90.1	93.4	97.5	78.1	10.55*	90.6	91.3	.15
8. Students	33.1	27.8	38.1	37.6	40.0	31.3	10.24*	33.3	32.7	.04
9. Other	11.9	13.0	14.8	8.4	10.0	12.5	4.85	10.6	14.0	2.41

<sup>a</sup>Only institutions with an institution-wide planning group for student assessment responded to this question

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.7 Executive Responsibility for Institution-Wide Student Assessment Planning Group by Institutional Type and Control**

Executive responsibility for institution-wide planning group assigned to following position or functional area	Institutions (%) Reporting									
	All N=955	Institutional Type <sup>a</sup> N=911					Institutional Control N=955			
		Assoc of Arts N=385	Bacca- laureate N=225	Master's N=229	Doctoral N=40	Research N=32	Chi-Square	Public N=596	Private N=359	Chi-Square
1. Academic affairs administrator	55.3	53.5	59.6	54.1	45.0	65.6	5.36	53.4	58.5	2.40
2. Student affairs administrator	7.3	12.7	2.7	3.1	2.5	6.3	32.03**	9.6	3.6	11.65**
3. Institutional research officer	17.7	18.2	19.1	17.0	12.5	15.6	1.27	17.4	18.1	.07
4. Academic review and evaluation officer	5.4	3.4	5.3	6.1	12.5	15.6	13.86**	4.7	6.7	1.72
5. Student assessment officer	8.1	8.3	9.8	8.3	5.0	3.1	2.33	9.2	6.1	2.91
6. Faculty member	31.1	29.6	28.4	38.0	42.5	9.4	15.62**	30.7	31.8	.12
7. Other	10.8	11.9	7.1	10.9	15.0	12.5	4.57	12.1	8.6	2.76

<sup>a</sup>Only institutions with an institution-wide planning group for student assessment responded to this question

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.8 Approval Authority for Student Assessment Plan or Policies by Institutional Type and Control**

Positions or functional areas within institution	Institutions (%) Assigning Approval Authority for Student Assessment Plan or Policies									
	All N=1305	Institutional Type N=1240						Institutional Control N=1305		
		Assoc of Arts N=515	Bacca- laureate N=301	Master's N=300	Doctoral N=64	Research N=60	Chi-Square	Public N=825	Private N=480	Chi-Square
1. Board of trustees	17.2	24.3	12.3	11.7	9.4	6.7	37.71**	19.3	13.8	6.49*
2. Chief executive officer	45.4	56.5	39.9	37.0	29.7	21.7	57.79**	49.5	38.5	14.58**
3. Chief academic affairs officer	75.3	71.8	76.1	80.3	76.6	88.3	12.97*	74.7	76.5	.52
4. Chief student affairs officer	19.7	28.2	13.0	13.3	10.9	18.3	43.07**	23.8	12.7	23.43**
5. Institutional research officer	18.2	20.2	20.6	15.0	10.9	18.3	6.73	18.7	17.5	.28
6. Academic review and evaluation officer	8.4	7.4	7.0	8.3	20.3	13.3	15.08**	8.7	7.9	.26
7. Student assessment officer	10.0	12.2	9.3	8.7	9.4	6.7	4.21	12.1	6.5	10.78**
8. Student government	1.2	.4	.3	3.7	1.6	--	20.80**	1.2	1.3	.01
9. Academic senate or other faculty committee	38.5	30.1	52.2	47.7	29.7	21.7	58.27**	32.8	48.1	29.92**
10. Faculty union	4.4	3.3	7.3	4.7	1.6	--	11.68*	3.5	5.8	3.90*
11. Other	13.9	16.3	14.6	11.3	4.7	5.0	12.94*	14.5	12.7	.86

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.9 Operating Responsibility for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities by Institutional Type and Control**

Positions or functional areas with operating responsibility	Institutions (%) Assigning Operating Responsibility for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities									
	All N=1380	Institutional Type N=1313					Institutional Control N=1380			
		Assoc of Arts N=545	Bacca- laureate N=313	Master's N=311	Doctoral N=65	Research N=79	Chi-Square	Public N=879	Private N=501	Chi-Square
1. Academic affairs administrator	45.4	42.0	54.3	44.4	47.7	40.5	13.52**	42.3	50.9	9.47**
2. Student affairs administrator	19.6	24.2	13.7	15.8	13.8	22.8	19.16**	21.2	16.8	3.92*
3. Institutional research officer	45.3	49.4	41.9	47.3	36.9	48.1	7.05	46.6	42.9	1.79
4. Academic review and evaluation officer	9.1	5.9	10.2	11.3	16.9	15.2	17.06**	8.5	10.0	.81
5. Student assessment officer	15.2	17.6	12.5	14.5	15.4	12.7	4.81	18.5	9.4	20.77**
6. Faculty member	32.6	27.2	39.0	38.6	32.3	19.0	24.93**	27.8	41.1	25.92**
7. Other	12.5	10.6	9.9	16.1	9.2	19.0	11.08*	11.4	14.4	2.62
8. No one	3.3	3.7	2.6	3.2	--	8.9	10.21*	3.2	3.6	.16

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.10 Reporting Relationship for Operating Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities by Institutional Type and Control**

Reporting office for individual with operating responsibility for student assessment	Institutions (%) with Operational Reporting Line for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities									
	All N=1324	Institutional Type N=1256						Institutional Control N=1324		
		Assoc of Arts N=524	Bacca- laureate N=299	Master's N=298	Doctoral N=64	Research N=71	Chi-Square	Public N=850	Private N=474	Chi-Square
1. Chief executive officer	28.9	37.4	28.4	18.5	9.4	5.6	65.64**	28.5	29.7	.24
2. Chief academic officer	56.3	42.6	65.9	71.1	76.6	60.6	89.03**	52.2	63.7	16.30**
3. Chief student affairs officer	7.3	12.6	2.0	3.0	6.3	11.3	43.33**	10.1	2.3	27.25**
4. Institutional research officer	2.5	2.3	1.7	4.0	--	4.2	6.17	2.9	1.7	1.97
5. Academic review and evaluation officer	1.5	1.1	2.0	1.0	1.6	4.2	4.99	1.3	1.9	.75
6. Other	10.3	11.3	6.0	11.1	7.8	21.1	16.01**	11.8	7.6	5.74*

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 5.11 Existence of Office Providing Faculty Consultation for Using Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Institutions with Office Providing Faculty Consultation for Using Student Assessment		
	N	%
All Institutions (N=1371)	649	47.3
Institutional Type (N=1303)		
Associate of Arts (N=540)	251	46.5
Baccalaureate (N=309)	125	40.5
Master's (N=309)	165	53.4
Doctoral (N=65)	33	50.8
Research (N=80)	51	63.8
Chi-Square		19.31**
Institutional Control (N=1371)		
Public (N=874)	443	50.7
Private (N=497)	206	41.4
Chi-Square		10.85**

\*\*  $p < .01$



**Table 5.12 Institutional Evaluation of Student Assessment Process by Institutional Type and Control**

Status of Student Assessment Evaluation	Institutions (%) Engaging in Evaluation Activities									
	All N=1363	Institutional Type N=1295					Institutional Control N=1363			
		Assoc of Arts N=535	Bacca- laureate N=307	Master's N=309	Doctoral N=64	Research N=80	Public N=866	Private N=497		
1. Institution has conducted formal evaluation	22.2	26.0	21.2	18.8	15.6	17.5	23.3	20.1		
2. Institution has conducted informal evaluation	27.4	26.4	25.7	30.4	34.4	18.8	27.9	26.6		
3. Institution is currently developing evaluation plans	29.2	27.7	32.6	31.4	23.4	25.0	26.9	33.2		
4. Institution is not evaluating or planning to evaluate assessment process	21.2	20.0	20.5	19.4	26.6	38.8	21.8	20.1		
				Chi-Square 28.69**			Chi-Square 6.40			
Elements of Assessment Process Evaluated <sup>a</sup>	Institutional Type N=629								Institutional Control N=668	
	All N=668	Assoc of Arts N=276	Bacca- laureate N=143	Master's N=151	Doctoral N=31	Research N=28	Chi-Square	Public N=439	Private N=229	Chi-Square
1. Student assessment plan and policies	80.7	78.6	89.5	78.8	67.7	78.6	11.61*	79.3	83.4	1.65
2. Structure and responsibility for student assessment	64.4	60.9	73.4	67.5	51.6	60.7	9.61*	61.5	69.9	4.59*
3. Achievement of intended objectives for student assessment	70.1	70.7	75.5	73.5	51.6	60.7	9.01	68.8	72.5	.98
4. Reliability and validity of assessment instruments and methods	53.7	57.6	52.4	51.7	32.3	53.6	7.77	54.2	52.8	.12
5. Quality of data analysis	50.9	49.3	54.5	54.3	32.3	57.1	6.48	49.2	54.1	1.47
6. Use of assessment information in decision-making	66.2	68.8	73.4	60.3	45.2	75.0	13.67**	65.6	67.2	.18
7. Problems encountered while conducting assessment activities	69.3	66.7	74.1	73.5	58.1	75.0	5.94	69.2	69.4	.01
8. Comparison of costs and benefits of student assessment	22.2	22.8	30.8	23.2	3.2	7.1	15.68**	21.0	24.5	1.07

<sup>a</sup> Only institutions that had formally or informally evaluated their student assessment process answered this question

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 6.1 Resource Allocation Policies for Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Resource allocation policies or practices intended to support the collection or use of student assessment information	Institutions (%) with Resource Allocation Policy or Practice									
	All N=1360	Institutional Type N=1293					Institutional Control N=1360			
		Associate of Arts N=538	Bacca- laureate N=304	Master's N=308	Doctoral N=65	Research N=78	Chi-Square	Public N=867	Private N=493	Chi-Square
1. Explicit line item operating budget allocation for student assessment	49.1	47.2	56.6	53.2	46.2	33.3	17.29**	48.1	50.9	.99
2. Academic budget process considers student performance indicators informally in resource allocation to academic units	22.9	26.4	15.1	25.0	21.5	20.5	15.24**	26.1	17.4	13.22**
3. Academic budget process compares academic units on student performance indicators and allocates resources competitively among them	1.9	1.9	2.3	1.9	--	2.6	1.68	2.0	1.8	.03
4. Academic budget process rewards academic units for improvement based on student performance indicators	3.3	2.8	2.6	4.9	3.1	6.4	5.22	3.8	2.4	1.85

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 6.2 Student Assessment Information System Policies by Institutional Type and Control**

Policies or practices regarding student assessment information systems	Institutions (%) with Student Assessment Information System Policy or Practice									
	All N=1360	Institutional Type N=1293						Institutional Control N=1360		
		Associate of Arts N=538	Bacca- laureate N=304	Master's N=308	Doctoral N=65	Research N=78	Chi-Square	Public N=867	Private N=493	Chi-Square
1. Key student assessment activities scheduled into the academic calendar	57.3	58.4	64.1	55.5	47.7	38.5	20.24**	54.4	62.3	7.88**
2. Computerized student information system which includes student performance indicators	27.7	34.2	19.1	24.4	21.5	30.8	26.06**	31.9	20.3	21.35**
3. Student information system tracks students from application through graduation	41.9	41.4	39.8	42.9	43.1	55.1	6.25	42.3	41.2	.17
4. Student assessment database integrated with faculty, curricular and financial databases	9.8	13.6	7.6	7.5	4.6	6.4	15.22**	10.7	8.1	2.43

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 6.3 Access to and Distribution of Student Assessment Information by Institutional Type and Control**

	Institutions (%) with Student Assessment Information Policy or Practice									
	All N=1360	Institutional Type N=1293						Institutional Control N=1360		
		Associate of Arts N=538	Bacca- laureate N=304	Master's N=308	Doctoral N=65	Research N=78	Chi-Square	Public N=867	Private N=493	Chi-Square
Student assessment information on individual students is available to:										
1. Institutional research, assessment or evaluation professionals	76.0	83.3	72.0	77.3	66.2	70.5	22.51**	78.8	71.2	9.91**
2. Senior academic administrators	71.9	77.3	75.0	68.8	53.8	56.4	30.63**	70.2	74.8	3.30
3. Department chairs or academic program administrators	73.4	77.9	71.1	76.0	61.5	62.8	16.55**	73.8	72.6	.23
4. Student affairs professionals	57.9	70.4	51.0	49.4	40.0	47.4	61.99**	63.1	48.9	26.03**
5. Faculty advisors	66.4	71.4	65.5	62.7	55.4	56.4	14.27**	65.4	68.2	1.07
Student assessment reports are regularly distributed to:										
1. Students	19.0	18.6	20.4	17.2	18.5	17.9	1.06	20.1	17.2	1.63
2. Faculty	67.2	69.0	71.4	67.5	60.0	41.0	28.88**	66.3	68.8	.85
3. Academic administrators	85.9	84.2	90.5	87.3	87.7	82.1	8.09	85.5	86.6	.34
4. Student affairs professionals	58.4	67.1	51.0	52.3	49.2	62.8	31.30**	62.5	51.1	16.81**
5. Employers	4.6	6.5	2.0	3.6	4.6	7.7	11.36*	6.2	1.8	13.79**
6. General public	8.2	9.1	7.2	6.5	10.8	14.1	6.09	11.0	3.2	24.94**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 6.4 Extent of Student Policies on Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Student Policies and Practices on Student Assessment	Extent Policy or Practice Exists at Institution <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1334	Institutional Type N= 1270						Institutional Control N=1334		
		Associate of Arts N=529	Bacca- laureate N=306	Master's N=302	Doctoral N=61	Research N=72	F	Public N=849	Private N=485	<i>t</i>
1. Students required to participate in student assessment activities	3.77 (1.41)	3.81 (1.45)	4.02 (1.29)	3.66 (1.37)	3.58 (1.37)	2.79 (1.42)	12.34**	3.71 (1.45)	3.88 (1.34)	-2.11*
2. Students provided incentives to encourage participation in student assessment activities	1.87 (1.23)	1.72 (1.25)	2.06 (1.27)	1.91 (1.16)	1.83 (1.04)	1.87 (1.08)	3.76**	1.78 (1.19)	2.02 (1.28)	-3.25**
3. Students provided information regarding purpose and uses of student assessment	3.52 (1.41)	3.49 (1.49)	3.72 (1.34)	3.42 (1.34)	3.26 (1.32)	2.99 (1.38)	4.89**	3.48 (1.43)	3.58 (1.38)	-1.32
4. Students provided individual feedback regarding student performance results	3.21 (1.45)	3.38 (1.49)	3.25 (1.43)	2.97 (1.31)	2.66 (1.40)	2.58 (1.25)	9.31**	3.26 (1.46)	3.12 (1.43)	1.66

<sup>a</sup> 1=not done at all; 2=done in a few depts.; 3=done in some depts.; 4=done in many depts.; 5=done in most depts.

\*  $p < .05$ ;  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 6.5 Extent of Professional Development Policies on Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Professional Development Policies and Practices on Student Assessment	Extent Policy or Practice Exists at Institution <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1338	Institutional Type N=1276						Institutional Control N=1338		
		Associate of Arts N=527	Bacca- laureate N=304	Master's N=306	Doctoral N=64	Research N=75	F	Public N=847	Private N=491	<i>t</i>
1. Faculty required to receive training on student assessment	2.47 (1.56)	2.76 (1.62)	2.48 (1.60)	2.19 (1.36)	1.84 (1.16)	1.51 (.93)	17.43**	2.47 (1.54)	2.48 (1.59)	-.04
2. Funds available for faculty to attend assessment conferences	3.08 (1.45)	3.41 (1.48)	3.08 (1.48)	2.85 (1.29)	2.76 (1.20)	2.05 (.90)	20.24**	3.14 (1.42)	2.98 (1.48)	2.04*
3. Workshops or consultative services on use of student assessment offered to faculty	2.90 (1.51)	3.09 (1.54)	2.71 (1.56)	2.83 (1.44)	2.92 (1.46)	2.42 (1.33)	5.32**	2.98 (1.49)	2.76 (1.55)	2.55*
4. Assistance (paid leaves, stipends, course reduction, etc.) provided to faculty to improve use of student assessment	2.00 (1.32)	2.12 (1.42)	1.89 (1.29)	1.96 (1.22)	2.15 (1.32)	1.65 (.91)	3.11*	2.10 (1.35)	1.84 (1.24)	3.44**
5. Workshops/seminars provided for academic administrators to improve use of assessment	2.55 (1.47)	2.76 (1.53)	2.39 (1.46)	2.50 (1.41)	2.42 (1.40)	2.06 (1.24)	5.97**	2.61 (1.46)	2.45 (1.49)	1.89
6. Student affairs staff required to receive training on assessment	2.22 (1.45)	2.51 (1.57)	1.94 (1.34)	2.05 (1.32)	2.13 (1.33)	1.85 (1.05)	10.48**	2.32 (1.48)	2.04 (1.40)	3.39**
7. Workshops on student assessment provided for student affairs administrators	2.22 (1.45)	2.54 (1.56)	1.87 (1.31)	2.04 (1.32)	2.00 (1.33)	2.21 (1.45)	12.77**	2.37 (1.48)	1.95 (1.37)	5.24**

<sup>a</sup> 1=not done at all; 2=done in a few depts.; 3=done in some depts.; 4=done in many depts.; 5=done in most depts.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 6.6 Extent of Faculty Evaluation and Reward Policies on Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control**

Faculty Evaluation and Reward Policies and Practices on Student Assessment	Extent Policy or Practice Exists at Institution <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1336	Institutional Type N=1273						Institutional Control N=1336		
		Associate of Arts N=529	Bacca- laureate N=305	Master's N=303	Doctoral N=63	Research N=73	F	Public N=848	Private N=488	<i>t</i>
1. Faculty evaluation for promotion considers evidence of student performance	1.84 (1.39)	1.69 (1.35)	2.05 (1.54)	1.94 (1.34)	1.63 (1.12)	1.83 (1.29)	3.96**	1.70 (1.28)	2.08 (1.54)	-4.59**
2. Faculty evaluation for salary and merit incorporates evidence of student performance	1.56 (1.17)	1.41 (1.09)	1.67 (1.30)	1.60 (1.11)	1.57 (1.06)	1.78 (1.17)	3.74**	1.51 (1.12)	1.64 (1.25)	-1.96
3. Promotion, tenure or salary reviews consider faculty scholarship on assessment	2.01 (1.38)	1.74 (1.34)	2.27 (1.56)	2.27 (1.30)	2.24 (1.30)	1.97 (1.05)	10.79**	1.93 (1.32)	2.14 (1.47)	-2.57*
4. Promotion, tenure or salary reviews consider faculty participation in assessment	1.99 (1.41)	1.85 (1.41)	2.35 (1.60)	2.04 (1.29)	1.98 (1.15)	1.63 (.99)	7.56**	1.85 (1.30)	2.24 (1.56)	-4.56**
5. Faculty publicly recognized for effective use of assessment	1.58 (1.06)	1.62 (1.12)	1.58 (1.15)	1.58 (.96)	1.53 (.88)	1.44 (.69)	.51	1.60 (1.04)	1.56 (1.10)	.62
6. Faculty hiring process considers skill in assessment	1.68 (1.10)	1.84 (1.28)	1.66 (1.12)	1.56 (.88)	1.52 (.87)	1.33 (.53)	5.86**	1.70 (1.12)	1.65 (1.07)	.77
7. Faculty encouraged to assess student learning in classes	3.99 (1.31)	4.18 (1.23)	4.12 (1.33)	3.81 (1.25)	3.57 (1.30)	3.16 (1.31)	14.91**	3.93 (1.30)	4.10 (1.31)	-2.32*

<sup>a</sup> 1=not done at all; 2=done in a few depts.; 3=done in some depts.; 4=done in many depts.; 5=done in most depts.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.

**Table 6.7 Extent Academic Planning and Review Policies Incorporate Assessment Data by Institutional Type and Control**

Institution incorporates student performance data into following academic planning and review processes	Extent Policy or Practice Exists at Institution <sup>a</sup>									
	All N=1336	Institutional Type N=1273						Institutional Control N=1336		
		Associate of Arts N=526	Bacca- laureate N=306	Master's N=303	Doctoral N=63	Research N=75	F	Public N=847	Private N=489	<i>t</i>
1. Academic department or under-graduate program planning or review	3.67 (1.41)	3.65 (1.46)	3.72 (1.44)	3.78 (1.26)	3.37 (1.47)	3.29 (1.36)	2.65*	3.70 (1.40)	3.63 (1.42)	.85
2. General education or core curriculum review	3.55 (1.52)	3.61 (1.51)	3.72 (1.53)	3.42 (1.52)	3.16 (1.54)	3.04 (1.40)	4.69**	3.53 (1.52)	3.59 (1.52)	-.69
3. Course-level review and development	3.36 (1.38)	3.57 (1.38)	3.28 (1.44)	3.24 (1.30)	3.02 (1.34)	2.84 (1.25)	7.60**	3.40 (1.37)	3.30 (1.41)	1.19
4. Review and planning for student academic support services	3.09 (1.43)	3.22 (1.44)	3.07 (1.50)	2.92 (1.38)	2.75 (1.29)	2.78 (1.16)	3.76**	3.10 (1.42)	3.08 (1.45)	.25

<sup>a</sup> 1=not done at all; 2=done in a few depts.; 3=done in some depts.; 4=done in many depts.; 5=done in most depts.

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples.



**Table 7.1 Influence of Student Assessment Information in Institutional Decisions**

Decisions regarding following institutional actions	% Institutions Reporting Extent of Influence of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>						
	N = 1393						
	1	2	3	4	Missing	Mean	SD
1. Revising undergraduate academic mission or goals	44.0	12.3	29.1	10.1	4.4	2.06	1.09
2. Designing or reorganizing academic programs or majors	23.8	12.1	45.2	15.1	3.9	2.54	1.03
3. Designing or reorganizing student affairs units	49.8	12.8	25.1	7.9	4.3	1.91	1.05
4. Allocating resources to academic units	49.6	18.7	23.4	3.9	4.4	1.81	.94
5. Modifying student assessment plans, policies or processes	22.7	12.3	39.5	20.6	5.0	2.61	1.07
6. Faculty promotion and tenure	67.4	13.4	12.4	1.7	5.1	1.46	.78
7. Faculty salary increases or rewards	70.4	13.4	9.8	1.3	5.2	1.39	.73
8. Modifying general education curriculum	26.0	14.5	39.2	15.8	4.5	2.47	1.06
9. Modifying student out-of-class learning experiences	36.6	17.3	32.9	8.7	4.5	2.14	1.04
10. Creating or modifying distance learning initiatives	56.1	13.8	18.4	5.5	6.2	1.72	.97
11. Modifying teaching methods	22.5	16.5	45.9	11.0	4.1	2.47	.97
12. Modifying student academic support services	22.3	14.1	43.9	16.1	3.6	2.56	1.02

<sup>a</sup>1=no action or influence unknown; 2 = action taken, data not influential; 3 = action taken, data somewhat influential; 4 = action taken, data very influential

**Table 7.2 Influence of Student Assessment Information in Institutional Decisions by Institutional Type and Control**

Decisions regarding following institutional actions	Extent of Influence of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>								
	Institutional Type N=1281						Institutional Control N=1343		
	Associate of Arts N=528	Bacca-laureate N=305	Master's N=306	Doctoral N=64	Research N=78	F	Public N=850	Private N=493	<i>t</i>
1. Revising undergraduate academic mission or goals	2.06 (1.09)	2.09 (1.11)	2.16 (1.09)	1.92 (1.06)	1.51 (.82)	5.78**	2.05 (1.07)	2.07 (1.12)	-.45
2. Designing or reorganizing academic programs or majors	2.46 (1.04)	2.61 (1.05)	2.67 (.93)	2.38 (1.05)	2.33 (1.02)	3.58**	2.50 (1.02)	2.60 (1.04)	-1.77
3. Designing or reorganizing student affairs units	1.88 (1.04)	1.93 (1.09)	1.90 (1.02)	1.92 (1.07)	1.99 (1.15)	.27	1.89 (1.05)	1.94 (1.05)	-.99
4. Allocating resources to academic units	1.88 (.96)	1.77 (.95)	1.79 (.92)	1.59 (.89)	1.64 (.82)	2.41*	1.84 (.95)	1.74 (.93)	1.85
5. Modifying student assessment plans, policies or processes	2.70 (1.04)	1.55 (1.08)	2.60 (1.09)	2.56 (1.04)	2.29 (1.13)	2.90*	2.66 (1.06)	2.52 (1.10)	2.17*
6. Faculty promotion and tenure	1.36 (.73)	1.70 (.93)	1.45 (.73)	1.36 (.74)	1.32 (.58)	10.03**	1.37 (.70)	1.60 (.89)	-5.02**
7. Faculty salary increases or rewards	1.30 (.67)	1.49 (.81)	1.45 (.73)	1.34 (.72)	1.31 (.57)	4.23**	1.37 (.71)	1.42 (.75)	-1.09
8. Modifying general education curriculum	2.39 (1.06)	2.57 (1.05)	2.55 (1.04)	2.37 (1.13)	2.26 (.99)	2.75*	2.43 (1.05)	2.53 (1.08)	-1.70
9. Modifying student out-of-class learning experiences	2.00 (1.02)	2.34 (1.07)	2.22 (1.03)	2.16 (.95)	2.05 (.90)	5.92**	2.05 (1.01)	2.31 (1.07)	-4.33**
10. Creating or modifying distance learning initiatives	1.88 (1.02)	1.52 (.93)	1.70 (.94)	1.66 (.91)	1.51 (.80)	7.47**	1.86 (1.00)	1.47 (.88)	7.40**
11. Modifying teaching methods	2.51 (1.00)	2.43 (.98)	2.51 (.92)	2.38 (.96)	2.30 (.95)	1.14	2.48 (.97)	2.47 (.98)	.18
12. Modifying student academic support services	2.56 (1.01)	2.49 (1.05)	2.56 (1.00)	2.48 (1.05)	2.73 (.94)	.99	2.57 (1.02)	2.54 (1.02)	.46

<sup>a</sup> 1=no action or influence unknown; 2=action taken, data not influential; 3=action taken, data somewhat influential; 4=action taken, data very influential  
*p* < .05; \*\* *p* < .01

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples..

**Table 7.3 Internal Impacts of Student Assessment Information**

Internal Impacts	% Institutions Reporting Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>						
	N = 1393						
	1	2	3	4	Missing	Mean	SD
1. Stimulated campus discussions of undergraduate education	49.7	1.0	13.1	31.6	4.6	2.28	1.38
2. Contributed to faculty satisfaction	64.0	4.9	15.9	9.6	5.7	1.69	1.08
3. Contributed to faculty interest in teaching	62.0	1.2	13.2	18.7	5.0	1.88	1.25
4. Led to changes in teaching methods used	44.0	.2	15.0	35.8	5.0	2.45	1.39
5. Contributed to student satisfaction	54.8	.9	20.5	18.6	5.2	2.03	1.26
6. Affected student retention or graduation rates	47.2	.8	27.4	19.5	5.2	2.20	1.25
7. Affected student grade performance	55.6	.6	26.6	12.2	5.0	1.95	1.17
8. Affected student achievement on external examinations	58.0	.3	18.6	18.2	5.0	1.97	1.25

<sup>a</sup>1=not monitored, do not know; 2=monitored,negative impact; 3=monitored,no known impact; 4=monitored, positive impact

**Table 7.4 Internal Impacts of Student Assessment Information by Institutional Type and Control**

Internal Impacts	Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>								
	Institutional Type N=1270						Institutional Control N=1330		
	Associate of Arts N=529	Bacca- laureate N=303	Master's N=303	Doctoral N=65	Research N=70	F	Public N=843	Private N=487	<i>t</i>
1. Stimulated campus discussions of undergraduate education	2.12 (1.35)	2.57 (1.39)	2.41 (1.40)	2.17 (1.34)	2.08 (1.35)	6.38**	2.20 (1.35)	2.42 (1.42)	-2.82**
2. Contributed to faculty satisfaction	1.71 (1.11)	1.88 (1.14)	1.60 (1.00)	1.56 (1.02)	1.26 (.68)	5.93**	1.64 (1.05)	1.78 (1.12)	-2.16*
3. Contributed to faculty interest in teaching	1.86 (1.22)	1.98 (1.27)	1.89 (1.29)	1.75 (1.22)	1.60 (1.15)	1.61	1.86 (1.24)	1.92 (1.26)	-.84
4. Led to changes in teaching methods used	2.41 (1.39)	2.60 (1.35)	2.46 (1.42)	2.53 (1.40)	2.07 (1.39)	2.28	2.40 (1.39)	2.53 (1.38)	-1.60
5. Contributed to student satisfaction	1.99 (1.25)	2.11 (1.25)	2.04 (1.29)	1.95 (1.24)	1.90 (1.22)	.69	2.02 (1.26)	2.04 (1.25)	-.26
6. Affected student retention or graduation rates	2.24 (1.27)	2.26 (1.24)	2.15 (1.24)	2.00 (1.20)	2.07 (1.24)	1.02	2.22 (1.26)	2.17 (1.24)	.63
7. Affected student grade performance	2.08 (1.22)	1.91 (1.14)	1.80 (1.12)	1.78 (1.12)	1.81 (1.13)	3.38**	1.98 (1.19)	1.90 (1.14)	1.27
8. Affected student achievement on external examinations	2.01 (1.27)	1.99 (1.24)	1.94 (1.25)	1.98 (1.29)	1.72 (1.10)	.89	2.00 (1.27)	1.91 (1.21)	1.26

<sup>a</sup> 1=not monitored, do not know; 2=monitored, negative impact; 3=monitored, no known impact; 4=monitored, positive impact

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples..

**Table 7.5 External Impacts of Student Assessment Information**

External Impacts	% Institutions Reporting Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup> N = 1393						
	1	2	3	4	Missing	Mean	SD
1. Affected student application or acceptance rates	74.6	.7	12.8	6.5	5.4	1.48	.97
2. Affected allocation of state funding	73.3	1.0	10.0	7.0	8.7	1.46	.96
3. Affected evaluation from regional accreditation agency	39.3	2.7	11.8	39.6	6.7	2.55	1.39
4. Affected private fund-raising results	77.9	.1	9.1	7.0	5.9	1.42	.94
5. Affected success on grant applications	69.8	.2	10.8	12.9	6.2	1.65	1.13
6. Affected communications with external constituents	67.3	.4	10.1	16.7	5.5	1.75	1.21
7. Affected institutional reputation or image	60.1	.6	13.1	20.7	5.5	1.94	1.28

<sup>a</sup>1=not monitored, do not know; 2=monitored, negative impact; 3=monitored, no known impact; 4=monitored, positive impact

**Table 7.6 External Impacts of Student Assessment Information by Institutional Type and Control**

External Impacts	Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>								
	Institutional Type N=1257						Institutional Control N=1319		
	Associate of Arts N=524	Bacca- laureate N=299	Master's N=300	Doctoral N=64	Research N=70	F	Public N=839	Private N=480	<i>t</i>
1. Affected student application or acceptance rates	1.40 (.91)	1.63 (1.04)	1.50 (1.00)	1.44 (.94)	1.51 (.96)	2.59*	1.46 (.95)	1.53 (.99)	-1.18
2. Affected allocation of state funding	1.55 (1.05)	1.24 (.72)	1.43 (.92)	1.57 (1.06)	1.66 (1.10)	5.89**	1.64 (1.09)	1.11 (.49)	11.81**
3. Affected evaluation from regional accreditation agency	2.47 (1.40)	2.57 (1.38)	2.66 (1.40)	2.73 (1.40)	2.29 (1.35)	1.70	2.57 (1.39)	2.52 (1.40)	.57
4. Affected private fund-raising results	1.28 (.80)	1.65 (1.11)	1.44 (.96)	1.43 (.96)	1.41 (.91)	7.51**	1.33 (.85)	1.57 (1.07)	-4.17**
5. Affected success on grant applications	1.69 (1.18)	1.75 (1.18)	1.56 (1.07)	1.58 (1.11)	1.40 (.91)	2.07	1.63 (1.13)	1.67 (1.15)	-.62
6. Affected communications with external constituents	1.65 (1.15)	1.87 (1.26)	1.81 (1.26)	1.76 (1.24)	1.76 (1.20)	1.85	1.76 (1.22)	1.73 (1.20)	.51
7. Affected institutional reputation or image	1.91 (1.29)	2.04 (1.30)	1.99 (1.31)	1.71 (1.15)	1.73 (1.15)	1.57	1.97 (1.30)	1.89 (1.26)	1.08

<sup>a</sup> 1=not monitored, do not know; 2=monitored, negative impact; 3=monitored, no known impact; 4=monitored, positive impact

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for institutional type were estimated using one-way ANOVA. Group means for institutional control were compared using *t* test for independent samples..

**Table 8.1 Factor Analysis Results by Section of Questionnaire**

Section of Survey	Factors - Variable Name*	Factor Loading	Alpha Reliability
I. Institutional Approach to Student Assessment			
A. Extent by Content	<b>Factor 1 - Cognitive Assessment</b>		.71
	IA5 competence in major field	.77	
	IA4 general education competencies	.72	
	IA3 higher-order skills	.69	
	IA6 vocational or professional skills	.69	
	<b>Factor 2 - Affective Assessment</b>		.68
	IA8 student experiences and involvement with institution	.81	
	IA9 student satisfaction with institution	.70	
	IA7 personal growth affective development	.68	
	<b>Factor 3 - Postcollege Assessment</b>		.83
	IA11 vocational or professional outcomes	.89	
	IA12 further education	.87	
	IA14 satisfaction/experiences with institution after leaving	.80	
	<i>IA1 academic intentions</i>		
	<i>IA2 basic college-readiness skills</i>		
	<i>IA10 academic progress</i>		
	<i>IA13 civic/social roles of former students</i>		
C. Other Student Assessment Methods	<b>Factor 4 - Student-Centered Methods</b>		.61
	IC3 student performance in capstone courses	.79	
	IC2 student portfolios or comprehensive projects	.77	
	IC1 observations of student performance	.56	
	IC4 student interviews or focus groups	.51	
	<b>Factor 5 - External Methods</b>		.63
	IC9 employer interviews or focus groups	.77	
	IC8 alumni interviews or focus groups	.74	
	<i>IC5 transcript analysis</i>		
	<i>IC6 external examinations</i>		
	<i>IC7 surveys/interviews with withdrawing students</i>		

\*italicized questionnaire items did not load on factors

**Table 8.1 continued**

---

E. Student Assessment Studies	<b>Factor 6 - Curricular Experience Studies</b>	.69
	IE2 exposure to different teaching methods	.69
	IE3 patterns of student-faculty interaction	.69
	IE9 classroom, library and/or computing resources	.68
	IE8 academic advising patterns	.65
	IE1 course-taking patterns	.60
	<b>Factor 7 - Co-curricular Experience Studies</b>	.70
	IE5 residence arrangements	.80
	IE4 extra-curricular activities	.73
	IE6 financial aid and/or employment	.70
	IE7 admission standards or policies	.63
<hr/>		
II. Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment		
B. Purpose of Student Assessment	<b>Factor 8 - Internal Purposes</b>	.79
	IIB4 guiding undergraduate academic program improvement	.85
	IIB5 improving achievement of undergraduate students	
	IIB6 improving faculty instructional performance	.84
	IIB3 guiding resource allocation decisions	.75
		.71
	<i>IIB1 conduct for accreditation</i>	
	<i>IIB2 conduct for state</i>	
<hr/>		
IV. Assessment Management Policies and Practices		
E. Student Policies on Student Assessment	<b>Factor 9 - Student Involvement</b>	.69
	IVE3 students informed about student assessment purpose and uses	.79
	IVE1 students required to participate in assessment activities	.75
	IVE4 students provided individual feedback on assessment results	.75
	<i>IVE2 student incentives</i>	

---



**Table 8.1 continued**

F. Professional Development	<b>Factor 10 - Professional Development</b>	.77
	IVF2 funds for faculty to attend assessment conferences .76 IVF3 student assessment workshops for faculty .76 IVF4 faculty assistance for using assessment .67 IVF5 student assessment workshops for academic administrators .66	
	<b>Factor 11 - Student Affairs</b>	.84
	IVF6 assessment training required for student affairs staff .88 IVF7 student assessment workshops for student affairs administrators .87	
	<i>IV1 faculty training required</i>	
G. Faculty Evaluation and Rewards	<b>Factor 12 - Faculty Evaluation</b>	.77
	IVG1 promotion evaluation includes student performance .77 IVG2 salary evaluation includes student performance .76 IVG4 evaluation considers faculty participation in student assessment .73 IVG3 evaluation considers scholarship on student assessment .71 IVG5 public recognition for faculty use of assessment .50	
	<i>IVG6 hiring process</i>	
	<i>IVG7 encourage faculty to assess</i>	
H. Academic Planning and Review	<b>Factor 13 - Academic Planning and Review</b>	.84
	IVH3 course review uses assessment data .84 IVH1 department or program planning uses assessment data .84 IVH2 curriculum review uses assessment data .83 IVH4 academic support service planning uses assessment data .76	

**Table 8.1 continued**V. Uses and Impacts of  
Student Assessment

---

A. Decision Making	<b>Factor 14 - Academic Decisions</b>		.83
	VA11 modify instructional or teaching methods	.71	
	VA2 design academic programs or majors	.69	
	VA8 revise general education curriculum	.66	
	VA9 create out-of-class learning experiences	.66	
	VA1 revise undergraduate academic mission	.64	
	VA12 modify student academic support services	.64	
	VA5 modify assessment plans or processes	.60	
	VA3 design student affairs units	.58	
	VA4 allocate resources to academic units	.57	
	VA10 create distance learning initiatives	.54	
	<b>Factor 15 - Faculty Decisions</b>		.79
	VA7 decide faculty salary increases	.90	
	VA6 decide faculty promotion and tenure	.90	
B. Institutional Impacts	<b>Factor 16 - Faculty Impacts</b>		.79
	VB3 faculty interest in teaching	.81	
	VB1 campus discussions of undergraduate education	.75	
	VB2 faculty satisfaction	.70	
	VB4 changes in teaching methods used	.63	
	<b>Factor 17 - Student Impacts</b>		.82
	VB7 student grade performance	.89	
	VB6 student retention or graduation	.83	
	VB8 student achievement on external examinations	.67	
	VB5 student satisfaction	.65	
	<b>Factor 18 - External Impacts</b>		.82
	VB13 success on grant applications	.77	
	VB14 communication with external constituents	.76	
	VB12 private fund-raising results	.75	
	VB15 institutional reputation or image	.66	
	VB10 allocation of state funding	.61	
	VB9 student applications or acceptance rates	.55	
	VB11 regional accreditation evaluations	.49	

---

**Table 8.2 Additive Indices by Section of Questionnaire**

Section of Survey	Additive Index Label and Variables	Response Scoring	Possible Range of Scores
I. Institutional Approach to Student Assessment			
A. Extent by Content	<p><b>Additive Index 1 - Comprehensiveness of Data Collection</b> = <math>\sum</math> IA1 to IA14 response score</p> <p>IA1 academic intentions or expectations            IA2 basic college-readiness skills            IA3 higher-order skills            IA4 general education competencies            IA5 competence in major field            IA6 vocational or professional skills            IA7 personal growth affective development            IA8 student experiences and involvement with institution            IA9 student satisfaction with institution            IA10 academic progress            IA11 vocational or professional outcomes            IA12 further education            IA13 civic or social roles            IA14 satisfaction/experiences with institution after leaving</p>	<p>1 = not collected            2 = collected for some students            3 = collected for many students            4 = collected for all students</p>	14 - 56
A. Timing by Content	<p><b>Additive Index 2 - Timing of Data Collection</b> = <math>\sum</math> IA1 to IA9 response score</p> <p>IA1 academic intentions or expectations            IA2 basic college-readiness skills            IA3 higher-order skills            IA4 general education competencies            IA5 competence in major field            IA6 vocational or professional skills            IA7 personal growth affective development            IA8 student experiences and involvement with institution            IA9 student satisfaction with institution</p>	<p>1 = not collected            2 = collected at one point in time            3 = collected at entry and while enrolled, or while enrolled and at exit            4 = collected at entry and at exit            5 = collected at entry, while enrolled and at exit</p>	9 - 45

**Table 8.2 continued**

B. Student Assessment Instruments by Content and Source	<b>Additive Index 3 - Number of Instruments =</b> $\Sigma$ IB1 to IB10 response score	1 = yes; 0 = no for each of the following sources of instruments: institutionally developed state provided commercially developed	0 - 30
	IB1 student plans, goals or expectations IB2 basic college-readiness skills IB3 higher-order skills IB4 general education competencies IB5 competence in major field IB6 vocational or professional skills IB7 personal growth and affective development IB8 student effort, experiences or involvement with institution IB9 student satisfaction with institution IB10 alumni satisfaction and experiences		
E. Student Assessment Studies	<b>Additive Index 4 - Number of Studies =</b> $\Sigma$ IE1 to IE9 response score	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 9
	IE1 course-taking patterns IE2 exposure to different teaching methods IE3 patterns of student-faculty interaction IE4 extra-curricular activities IE5 residence arrangements IE6 financial aid and/or employment IE7 admission standards or policies IE8 academic advising patterns IE9 classroom, library and/or computing resources		
F. Student Performance Profiles or Reports by Levels of Aggregation	<b>Additive Index 5 - Number of Reports =</b> $\Sigma$ IF1 to IF5 response score	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 5
	IF1 institution wide IF2 schools or colleges IF3 academic programs or departments IF4 special populations or subgroups of students IF5 by course or groups of courses		
II. Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment			
A. Institutional Emphasis	<b>Additive Index 6 - Mission Emphasis =</b> $\Sigma$ IIA1a to IIA1c response score	1 = yes 0 = no	0-3
	IIA1a emphasizes excellence in undergraduate education IIA1b identifies educational outcomes intended for students IIA1c refers to student assessment as important activity		

**Table 8.2 continued**

C. Administrative and Governance Activities	<b>Additive Index 7 - Administrative and Governance Activities</b> <b>Activities</b> = $\sum$ IIC1 to IIC7 response score	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 7
	IIC1 annual institution-wide initiatives, forums or seminars on student assessment IIC2 rewards/incentives for administrators promoting use of student assessment IIC3 incentives for academic units to use assessment information IIC4 assessment workshops for administrators IIC5 board of trustees committee addresses assessment issues IIC6 faculty governance committee addresses assessment issues IIC7 student representation on assessment committees		
D. Support for Student Assessment	<b>Additive Index 8 - Administrative and Faculty Support</b> <b>Support</b> = $\sum$ IID2 to IID5 response score	1 = very unsupportive 2 = somewhat unsupportive 3 = neutral, unknown 4 = somewhat supportive 5 = very supportive	4 - 20
	IID2 chief executive officer IID3 academic affairs administrators IID4 student affairs administrators IID5 faculty governance		
	<b>Additive Index 9 - Breadth of Assessment Planning Group</b> <b>Group</b> = $\sum$ IIE3a to IIE3i response score	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 9
	IIE3a chief executive officer IIE3b academic affairs administrators/staff IIE3c student affairs administrators/staff IIE3d institutional research administrators IIE3e academic review and evaluation administrators IIE3f student assessment administrators/staff IIE3g faculty IIE3h students IIE3i other		

**Table 8.2 continued**

	<p><b>Additive Index 10 - Number Approving Changes =</b>  <math>\sum</math> IIE5a to IIE5k response score</p>		
	IIE5a board of trustees	1 = yes	1 - 11
	IIE5b chief executive officer	0 = no	
	IIE5c chief academic affairs officer		
	IIE5d chief student affairs officer		
	IIE5e institutional research officer		
	IIE5f academic review and evaluation officer		
	IIE5g student assessment officer		
	IIE5h academic senate or other faculty committee		
	IIE5i faculty union		
	IIE5j student government		
	IIE5k other		
<hr/>			
IV. Assessment Management Policies and Practices			
A. Resource Allocation for Student Assessment	<p><b>Additive Index 11 - Resource Allocation Practices =</b>  <math>\sum</math> IVA1 to IVA4 response score</p>		
	IVA1 explicit budget allocation for student assessment	1 = yes	0 - 4
	IVA2 budget process informally considers student performance indicators in academic unit resource allocation	0 = no	
	IVA3 budget process competitively allocates resources to academic units based on student performance indicators		
	IVA4 budget process rewards academic units for improvement in student performance indicators		
	<p><b>Additive Index 12 - Budget Decisions =</b> <math>\sum</math> IVA3 to IVA4 response score</p>		
	IVA3 budget process competitively allocates resources to academic units based on student performance indicators	1 = yes	0 - 2
	IVA4 budget process rewards academic units for improvement in student performance indicators	0 = no	
<hr/>			
B. Student Assessment Information System	<p><b>Additive Index 13 - Computer Support =</b> <math>\sum</math> IVB2 to IVB4 response score</p>		
	IVB2 computerized student information system with student performance indicators	1 = yes	0 - 3
	IVB3 student information system tracks individual students	0 = no	
	IVB4 student assessment database integrated with other databases		

**Table 8.2 continued**

---

C. Access to Individual Student Assessment Information	<b>Additive Index 14 - Access to Information =</b> $\Sigma$ IVC1 to IVC5 response score		
	Assessment information on individual students available to: IVC1 institutional research or assessment professionals IVC2 senior academic administrators IVC3 department chairs or academic program administrators IVC4 student affairs professionals IVC5 faculty advisors	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 5
<hr/>			
D. Distribution of Student Assessment Reports and Studies	<b>Additive Index 15 - Distribution of Reports =</b> $\Sigma$ IVD1 to IVD6 response score		
	Assessment reports regularly distributed to: IVD1 students IVD2 faculty IVD3 academic administrators IVD4 student affairs professionals IVD5 employers IVD6 general public	1 = yes 0 = no	0 - 6

---

**Table 9.1 Number and Percentage of States<sup>1</sup> with:**

<b>A. Differing Governance Structures for Higher Education</b>									
<u>Consolidated</u> Governing		<u>Coordinating</u> Regulatory		<u>Coordinating</u> Advisory		<u>Planning</u> Agency		<u>Total</u>	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
20	39%	21	41%	4	8%	6	12%	51	100
<b>B. Differing Initiatives for Student Assessment<sup>2</sup></b>									
<u>Combination of</u> Policy & Statute		<u>State</u> Statute		<u>State</u> Policy		<u>No State Plan</u>		<u>Total</u>	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
8	17%	13	28%	21	46%	4	9%	46	100
<b>C. Common Institutional Indicator and Outcomes Requirements<sup>3</sup></b>									
<u>Common</u> for All		<u>Common for</u> Some		<u>Institutional</u> Specific		<u>No Indicators or</u> Outcomes		<u>Total</u>	
<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
15	34%	8	18%	12	27%	9	20%	44	100%

<sup>1</sup> Includes District of Columbia

<sup>2</sup> Five states did not provide information on this question.

<sup>3</sup> Seven states did not provide information on this question.



**Table 9.2 Percentage of Public Institutions with Assessment Initiatives by State Governance Structure**

Initiative for Student Assessment	All Inst. N=682	State Governance Structure (46 states) <sup>a</sup>					Chi-Square
		Consolidated Governing N=205	Coordinating Regulatory N=351	Coordinating Advisory N=81	Planning Agency N=45		
1. Combination of statute & policy	21.3	7.8	34.8	8.6	--	555.51**	
2. Statute	31.5	32.2	26.8	67.9	--		
3. Policy	38.9	60.0	38.5	--	15.6		
4. No state plan for assessment	8.4	--	--	23.5	84.4		

\*\*  $p < .01$

<sup>a</sup>Five states did not provide information on their assessment plan.

**Table 9.3 Percentage of Public Institutions with Common Indicators/Outcomes by State Governance Structure**

Indicators & Outcomes	All Inst. N=750	State Governance Structure (44 states) <sup>a</sup>				Chi-Square
		Consolidated	Coordinating	Coordinating	Planning	
		Governing N=243	Regulatory N=344	Advisory N=110	Agency N=53	
1. Common for all	31.5	10.7	42.4	56.4	17.0	362.59**
2. Common for some	26.6	42.4	20.9	20.0	--	
3. Institutional specific	27.8	35.4	33.7	--	3.8	
4. No indicators or outcomes	14.1	11.5	2.9	23.6	79.2	

\*\* $p < .01$

<sup>a</sup>Seven states did not provide information on their indicators or outcomes.

**Table 9.4 Percentage of Public Institutions with Common Indicators & Outcomes by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Indicators & Outcomes	All Inst. N=609	State Initiative for Student Assessment (44 states) <sup>a</sup>				
		Policy & Statute N=103	State Statute N=203	State Policy N=246	No State Plan N=57	Chi- Square
1. Common for all	31.5	30.1	54.7	20.3	--	568.31**
2. Common for some	26.6	42.7	41.4	13.8	--	
3. Institutional specific	27.8	27.2	--	56.5	3.5	
4. No indicators or outcomes	14.1	--	3.9	9.3	96.5	

\*\*  $p < .01$

<sup>a</sup>Seven states did not provide information on their indicators or outcomes.

**Table 9.5 Extent of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection: Type, Comprehensiveness and Timing	All Institutions N=885	State Governance Structure (51 states including DC)					F
		Consolidated	Coordinating	Coordinating	Planning	F	
		Governing N=255	Regulatory N=467	Advisory N=110	Agency N=53		
1. Academic intentions	3.22 (.97)	3.22 (.97)	3.18 (.99)	3.24 (.96)	3.43 (.84)	1.08	
2. Academic progress	3.70 (.59)	3.62 (.62)	3.72 (.58)	3.74 (.58)	3.80 (.46)	2.20	
3. Cognitive assessment	1.62 (.57)	1.63 (.55)	1.69 (.57)	1.27 (.52)	1.68 (.54)	16.86**	
4. Affective assessment	1.74 (.49)	1.79 (.49)	1.75 (.50)	1.58 (.46)	1.69 (.43)	4.92**	
5. Civic or social roles	1.55 (.78)	1.47 (.69)	1.62 (.85)	1.44 (.65)	1.53 (.75)	2.90*	
6. Postcollege assessment	2.27 (.59)	2.27 (.56)	2.35 (.59)	1.96 (.62)	2.28 (.45)	13.70**	
7. Comprehensiveness of data collection	35 (7)	35 (7)	36 (7)	32 (6)	36 (6)	13.27**	
8. Timing of data collection	18 (4)	19 (4)	19 (4)	17 (4)	19 (4)	5.17**	

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.6 Extent of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection: Type, Comprehensiveness and Timing	All Institutions N=682	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				F
		Policy & Statute N=144	State Statute N=215	State Policy N=265	No State Plan N=57	
1. Academic intentions	3.24 (.95)	3.27 (.89)	3.36 (.92)	3.10 (.99)	3.39 (.90)	3.66*
2. Academic progress	3.70 (.58)	3.68 (.59)	3.76 (.57)	3.67 (.59)	3.75 (.56)	1.13
3. Cognitive assessment	1.64 (.56)	1.74 (.53)	1.56 (.58)	1.65 (.56)	1.60 (.57)	3.07*
4. Affective assessment	1.75 (.49)	1.76 (.51)	1.81 (.50)	1.71 (.47)	1.64 (.40)	2.41
5. Civic or social roles	1.54 (.78)	1.61 (.86)	1.51 (.80)	1.51 (.73)	1.54 (.73)	0.55
6. Postcollege assessment	2.28 (.58)	2.33 (.57)	2.27 (.65)	2.27 (.55)	2.27 (.48)	0.51
7. Comprehensiveness of data collection	35 (7)	36 (6)	35 (7)	35 (7)	35 (5)	1.66
8. Timing of data collection	19 (4)	19 (4)	18 (4)	19 (5)	18 (4)	1.73

\*  $p < .05$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.7 Extent of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Requirement for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection:  Type, Comprehensiveness and Timing	All Institutions N=750	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)				F
		Common for All N=243	Common for Some N=197	Institution Specific N=204	No Indicators or Outcomes N=106	
1. Academic intentions	3.24 (.95)	3.11 (1.02)	3.28 (.91)	3.32 (.89)	3.30 (.94)	2.28
2. Academic progress	3.70 (.58)	3.81 (.48)	3.61 (.66)	3.66 (.60)	3.70 (.60)	4.10**
3. Cognitive assessment	1.62 (.56)	1.51 (.60)	1.63 (.53)	1.72 (.53)	1.64 (.55)	5.09**
4. Affective assessment	1.75 (.49)	1.71 (.51)	1.75 (.49)	1.80 (.48)	1.73 (.46)	1.06
5. Civic or social roles	1.56 (.79)	1.64 (.88)	1.47 (.70)	1.53 (.79)	1.61 (.70)	1.71
6. Postcollege assessment	2.28 (.60)	2.22 (.65)	2.26 (.56)	2.34 (.60)	2.30 (.50)	1.41
7. Comprehensiveness of data collection	35 (7)	34 (7)	35 (7)	36 (7)	36 (6)	1.43
8. Timing of data collection	19 (4)	18 (4)	19 (4)	19 (5)	18 (5)	2.33

\*\* $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.8 Student Assessment Data Collection Methods in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Data Collection Methods	All Institutions N=868	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)					F
		Consolidated		Coordinating	Coordinating	Planning	
		Governing N=252	Regulatory N=460	Advisory N=109	Agency N=53		
1. Number of instruments	9 (.4)	9 (.3)	10 (.4)	8 (.3)	10 (.4)	11.20**	
2. Transcript analysis	2.12 (1.10)	2.19 (1.15)	2.10 (1.09)	1.97 (1.03)	2.25 (1.04)	1.30	
3. External examinations	2.06 (.44)	2.08 (.43)	2.11 (.46)	1.82 (.41)	2.04 (.19)	13.90**	
4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students	2.21 (.93)	2.33 (.96)	2.16 (.89)	2.04 (.97)	2.39 (.90)	3.91**	
5. Student-centered methods	1.30 (.28)	1.30 (.27)	1.32 (.28)	1.23 (.26)	1.33 (.28)	2.79*	
6. External methods	2.06 (.58)	2.11 (.59)	2.07 (.58)	1.90 (.49)	2.16 (.60)	4.17**	

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.9 Student Assessment Data Collection Methods in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Data Collection Methods	All Institutions N=673	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				F
		Policy & Statute N=141	State Statute N=215	State Policy N=262	No State Plan N=57	
1. Number of instruments	9 (4)	10 (4)	9 (3)	9 (3)	10 (4)	5.23**
2. Transcript analysis	2.13 (1.09)	2.01 (1.01)	2.08 (1.09)	2.24 (1.16)	2.02 (.97)	1.76
3. External examinations	2.07 (.58)	2.07 (.52)	2.02 (.63)	2.11 (.57)	2.12 (.53)	1.32
4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students	2.23 (.93)	2.15 (.86)	2.16 (.93)	2.30 (.96)	2.43 (.94)	2.05**
5. Student-centered methods	1.32 (.27)	1.35 (.25)	1.27 (.26)	1.34 (.28)	1.32 (.27)	3.98**
6. External methods	2.07 (.58)	3.07 (.52)	2.02 (.63)	2.11 (.57)	2.12 (.53)	.98

\*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.



**Table 9.10 Student Assessment Data Collection Methods in Public Institutions by State Requirement for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Data Collection Methods	All Institutions N=740	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)				F
		Common for All N=241	Common for Some N=193	Institution Specific N=202	No Indicators or Outcomes N=105	
1. Number of instruments	9 (4)	9 (4)	9 (4)	10 (4)	10 (3)	3.05*
2. Transcript analysis	2.12 (1.10)	2.09 (1.09)	2.04 (1.09)	2.19 (1.15)	2.18 (1.07)	.77
3. External examinations	2.05 (.43)	2.02 (.52)	2.07 (.41)	2.03 (.35)	2.09 (.42)	.69
4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students	2.21 (.92)	2.07 (.90)	2.19 (.84)	2.23 (.95)	2.50 (.99)	5.34**
5. Student-centered methods	1.30 (.28)	1.27 (.27)	1.31 (.27)	1.31 (.28)	1.32 (.28)	1.50
6. External methods	2.07 (.57)	2.02 (.57)	2.04 (.58)	2.12 (.57)	2.18 (.53)	2.41

\*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.11 Student Assessment Studies and Reports in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Studies and Reports	All Institutions N=872	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)				F
		Consolidated	Coordinating	Coordinating	Planning	
		Governing N=251	Regulatory N=461	Advisory N=108	Agency N=52	
1. Number of studies	2 (.18)	2 (.17)	2 (.18)	2 (.19)	2 (.16)	.183
2. Curricular experience studies	.14 (.18)	.14 (.17)	.14 (.18)	.14 (.19)	.10 (.16)	.894
3. Co-curricular experience studies	.18 (.22)	.17 (.22)	.18 (.22)	.18 (.22)	.21 (.24)	.493
4. Conducts no studies	.40 (.49)	.41 (.49)	.39 (.49)	.38 (.49)	.40 (.50)	.143
5. Number of reports	3 (1)	2 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	5.74**

\*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.12 Student Assessment Studies and Reports in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Studies and Reports	All Institutions N=674	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				F
		Statute & Policy N=143	State Statute N=213	State Policy N=262	No State Plan N=56	
1. Number of studies	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	1.48
2. Curricular experience studies	.14 (.17)	.16 (.18)	.14 (.17)	.14 (.17)	.10 (.14)	1.81
3. Co-curricular experience studies	.19 (.22)	.22 (.24)	.17 (.22)	.18 (.22)	.20 (.22)	1.31
4. Conducts no studies	.38 (.49)	.35 (.48)	.39 (.49)	.40 (.49)	.34 (.48)	.40
5. Number of reports	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	2 (1)	3 (1)	3.70*

\*  $p < .05$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.13 Student Assessment Studies and Reports in Public Institutions by State Requirement for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Studies and Reports	All Institutions N=737	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)				F
		Common for All N=241	Common for Some N=193	Institution Specific N=199	No Indicators or Outcomes N=104	
1. Number of studies	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	2 (2)	.45
2. Curricular experience studies	.14 (.18)	.14 (.18)	.14 (.18)	.16 (.19)	.12 (.16)	1.00
3. Co-curricular experience studies	.18 (.22)	.19 (.23)	.17 (.22)	.18 (.23)	.18 (.21)	.22
4. Conducts no studies	.39 (.49)	.39 (.49)	.43 (.50)	.36 (.48)	.39 (.49)	.68
5. Number of reports	3 (1)	3 (1)	2 (2)	3 (1)	3 (1)	3.12*

\*  $p < .05$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.14 Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment	All Institutions N=875	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)				F
		Consolidated Governing N=251	Coordinating Regulatory N=464	Coordinating Advisory N=109	Planning Agency N=53	
1. Mission emphasis	1.48 (.90)	1.47 (.93)	1.55 (.89)	1.37 (.86)	1.17 (.81)	3.50*
2. Conduct for internal purposes	2.48 (.51)	2.53 (.47)	2.49 (.52)	2.37 (.51)	2.43 (.49)	2.85*
3. Conduct for accreditation	3.59 (.67)	3.65 (.60)	3.58 (.67)	3.50 (.80)	3.66 (.62)	1.67
4. Conduct for state	3.29 (.95)	3.32 (.95)	3.45 (.83)	2.84 (1.15)	2.77 (1.05)	18.33**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.15 Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment	All Institutions N=675	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				F
		Policy & Statute N=144	State Statute N=213	State Policy N=261	No State Plan N=57	
1. Mission emphasis	1.51 (.90)	1.58 (.90)	1.57 (.89)	1.47 (.93)	1.30 (.87)	1.84
2. Internal purposes	2.48 (.49)	2.53 (.47)	2.47 (.50)	2.48 (.50)	2.36 (.48)	1.71
3. Accreditation purposes	3.59 (.67)	3.57 (.64)	3.62 (.67)	3.57 (.68)	3.67 (.66)	.48
4. State purposes	3.28 (.95)	3.39 (.89)	3.43 (.89)	3.22 (.96)	2.75 (1.12)	8.73**

\*\*  $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.16 Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Requirements for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment	All Institutions N=742	Indicators and Outcomes (44 States Including DC)					F
		Common for All N=241	Common for Some N=194	Institution Specific N=203	No Indicators or Outcomes N=106		
1. Mission emphasis	1.48 (.90)	1.58 (.92)	1.37 (.86)	1.49 (.91)	1.45 (.92)	1.96	
2. Internal purposes	2.48 (.50)	2.44 (.51)	2.48 (.51)	2.53 (.47)	2.46 (.48)	1.32	
3. Accreditation purposes	3.59 (.67)	3.49 (.73)	3.60 (.63)	3.63 (.67)	3.71 (.59)	3.07*	
4. State purposes	3.25 (.97)	3.14 (1.01)	3.37 (.91)	3.46 (.82)	2.90 (1.13)	9.97**	

\* $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.17 Assessment Leadership and Governance in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Assessment Leadership and Governance	All Institutions N=876	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)				F
		Consolidated	Coordinating	Coordinating	Planning	
		Governing N=253	Regulatory N=462	Advisory N=108	Agency N=53	
1. Administrative and governance activities	2.33 (1.20)	2.28 (1.21)	2.35 (1.21)	2.37 (.51)	2.43 (.49)	.30
2. Administrative and faculty support	17.18 (2.54)	17.30 (2.38)	17.30 (2.48)	16.52 (2.85)	17.02 (2.95)	2.99*
3. Formal centralized student assessment policy	.51 (.50)	.51 (.50)	.57 (.50)	.28 (.45)	.49 (.50)	10.10**
4. Institution-wide group setting policy	.69 (.46)	.68 (.47)	.70 (.46)	.69 (.46)	.68 (.47)	.06
5. Breadth of assessment planning group	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (1)	4 (1)	.98
6. Number approving changes	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	2 (1)	1.46
7. No student assessment policy	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.



**Table 9.18 Assessment Leadership and Governance in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Assessment Leadership and Governance	All Institutions N=677	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				F
		Policy & Statute N=143	State Statute N=214	State Policy N=264	No State Plan N=56	
1. Administrative and governance activities	2.35 (1.20)	2.28 (1.22)	2.31 (1.29)	2.39 (1.12)	2.48 (1.18)	.44
2. Administrator and faculty support	17.27 (2.40)	17.66 (2.09)	17.09 (2.57)	17.32 (2.28)	16.71 (2.80)	2.64*
3. Formal centralized policy	.50 (.50)	.59 (.49)	.45 (.50)	.50 (.50)	.46 (.50)	2.42
4. Institution-wide planning group	.70 (.46)	.67 (.47)	.65 (.48)	.75 (.43)	.67 (.47)	2.21
5. Breadth of assessment planning group	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (1)	4 (1)	1.87
6. Number approving changes	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	2 (1)	2 (1)	2.17

\* $p < .05$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.19 Assessment Leadership and Governance in Public Institutions by State Requirements for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Assessment Leadership and Governance	All Institutions N=742	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)				F
		Common for All N=241	Common for Some N=193	Institution Specific N=203	No Indicators or Outcomes N=105	
1. Administrative and governance activities	2.36 (1.22)	2.33 (1.22)	2.37 (1.24)	2.35 (1.21)	2.44 (1.19)	.17
2. Administrator and faculty support	17.23 (2.50)	17.06 (2.66)	17.31 (2.35)	17.37 (2.41)	17.21 (2.57)	.62
3. Formal centralized policy	.49 (.50)	.42 (.50)	.49 (.50)	.59 (.49)	.49 (.50)	3.96**
4. Institution-wide planning group	.71 (.46)	.68 (.47)	.69 (.46)	.75 (.43)	.71 (.45)	.92
5. Breadth of assessment planning group	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (1)	4 (2)	4 (1)	2.40
6. Number approving changes	3 (1)	3 (2)	3 (2)	2 (2)	2 (1)	2.85*

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.20 Assessment Management Policies and Practices in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Assessment Management Policies and Practices	All Institutions N=866	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)				F
		Consolidated Governing N=247	Coordinating Regulatory N=446	Coordinating Advisory N=109	Planning Agency N=52	
1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach	.51 (.50)	.49 (.50)	.54 (.50)	.47 (.50)	.48 (.50)	1.03
2. Resource allocation practices	1.21 (.49)	1.17 (.48)	1.23 (.51)	1.17 (.38)	1.24 (.44)	.79
3. Access to information	3.51 (1.66)	3.46 (1.72)	3.63 (1.61)	3.20 (1.67)	3.36 (1.78)	2.32
4. Distribution of reports	2.52 (1.43)	2.51 (1.42)	2.63 (1.46)	2.24 (1.39)	2.13 (1.11)	3.50*
5. Student involvement policies	2.65 (.88)	2.70 (.84)	2.70 (.89)	2.36 (.89)	2.62 (.82)	4.48**
6. Student incentives	1.78 (1.19)	1.68 (1.17)	1.85 (1.23)	1.85 (1.19)	1.63 (.93)	1.41
7. Professional development policies	1.94 (.80)	1.89 (.81)	1.98 (.83)	1.79 (.64)	2.16 (.72)	3.12*
8. Faculty training required	2.47 (1.54)	2.55 (1.55)	2.52 (1.55)	2.00 (1.33)	2.63 (1.68)	3.76*
9. Student affairs policies	2.05 (1.21)	2.15 (1.25)	2.02 (2.21)	1.94 (1.11)	2.08 (1.19)	.98
10. Faculty evaluation policies	1.18 (.61)	1.17 (.65)	1.22 (.61)	1.08 (.58)	1.11 (.59)	1.83
11. Hiring process	1.70 (1.12)	1.78 (1.17)	1.72 (1.15)	1.42 (.75)	1.78 (1.15)	2.67*
12. Encourage faculty to assess	3.93 (1.30)	3.90 (1.32)	4.04 (1.24)	3.38 (1.41)	4.19 (1.22)	8.28**
13. Academic planning and review policies	2.80 (.96)	2.87 (1.00)	2.85 (.96)	2.49 (.89)	2.64 (.80)	4.83**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences in group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.21 Assessment Management Policies and Practices in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment Plan**

Assessment Management Policies and Practices	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)					F
	All Institutions N=668	Policy & Statute N=142	State Statute N=213	State Policy N=257	No State Plan N=56	
1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach	.52 (.50)	.54 (.50)	.59 (.49)	.46 (.50)	.50 (.50)	2.51
2. Resource allocation practices	1.21 (.48)	1.25 (.54)	1.24 (.49)	1.16 (.44)	1.19 (.40)	.93
3. Access to information	3.51 (1.66)	3.42 (1.71)	3.57 (1.66)	3.55 (1.61)	3.29 (1.79)	.62
4. Distribution of reports	2.60 (1.45)	2.65 (1.43)	2.65 (1.49)	2.63 (1.47)	2.20 (1.26)	1.61
5. Student involvement policies	2.62 (.88)	2.68 (.81)	2.70 (.93)	2.56 (.87)	2.49 (.85)	1.41
6. Student incentives	1.78 (1.17)	2.00 (1.17)	1.80 (1.22)	1.68 (1.16)	1.63 (.90)	2.52
7. Professional development policies	1.96 (.79)	2.05 (.80)	1.88 (.75)	1.96 (.83)	2.02 (.73)	1.37
8. Faculty training required	2.44 (1.53)	2.40 (1.53)	2.36 (1.46)	2.55 (1.56)	2.33 (1.59)	.74
9. Student affairs policies	2.06 (1.21)	1.92 (1.10)	2.24 (1.27)	2.05 (1.24)	1.80 (1.02)	2.95*
10. Faculty evaluation policies	1.19 (.62)	1.28 (.63)	1.20 (.65)	1.15 (.59)	1.14 (.60)	1.48
11. Hiring process	1.70 (1.12)	1.65 (1.10)	1.66 (1.10)	1.78 (1.17)	1.63 (1.07)	.69
12. Encourage faculty to assess	3.97 (1.26)	4.06 (1.14)	3.81 (1.35)	4.07 (1.22)	3.86 (1.39)	1.97
13. Academic planning and review policies	2.78 (.94)	2.90 (.89)	2.85 (.93)	2.73 (.99)	2.50 (.86)	2.91*

\*  $p < .05$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.22 Assessment Management Policies and Practices in Public Institutions by State Requirement for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Assessment Management Policies and Practices	All Institutions N=736	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)				
		Common for All N=240	Common for Institution N=195	Specific N=199	No Indicators or Outcomes N=102	F
1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach	.51 (.50)	.48 (.50)	.53 (.50)	.53 (.50)	.47 (.50)	.86
2. Resource allocation practices	1.22 (.50)	1.23 (.50)	1.22 (.54)	1.25 (.51)	1.15 (.36)	.63
3. Access to information	3.50 (1.66)	3.58 (1.69)	3.43 (1.69)	3.57 (1.60)	3.35 (1.69)	.70
4. Distribution of reports	2.54 (1.40)	2.53 (1.47)	2.55 (1.40)	2.65 (1.41)	2.37 (1.21)	.90
5. Student involvement policies	2.64 (.88)	2.60 (.93)	2.80 (.87)	2.62 (.83)	2.51 (.84)	2.24
6. Student incentives	1.77 (1.18)	1.73 (1.16)	1.85 (1.18)	1.84 (1.32)	1.55 (.88)	1.83
7. Professional development policies	1.96 (.81)	1.79 (.74)	1.98 (.83)	2.09 (.87)	2.03 (.70)	5.55**
8. Faculty training required	2.45 (1.53)	2.24 (1.41)	2.48 (1.57)	2.59 (1.58)	2.55 (1.57)	2.17
9. Student affairs policies	2.07 (1.21)	1.99 (1.17)	2.21 (1.28)	2.09 (1.23)	1.93 (1.14)	1.60
10. Faculty evaluation policies	1.17 (.59)	1.23 (.60)	1.18 (.61)	1.15 (.58)	1.08 (.56)	1.62
11. Hiring process	1.70 (1.11)	1.54 (.91)	1.75 (1.16)	1.87 (1.29)	1.67 (1.00)	3.32*
12. Encourage faculty to assess	3.91 (1.30)	3.73 (1.34)	3.85 (1.36)	4.11 (1.22)	4.05 (1.21)	3.50*
13. Academic planning and review policies	2.79 (.94)	2.74 (.93)	2.79 (.96)	2.89 (.97)	2.72 (.89)	1.06

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.23 Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Governance Structure for Higher Education**

Uses and Impacts	All Institutions N=827	State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)					F
		Consolidated Governing N=241	Coordinating Regulatory N=438	Coordinating Advisory N=103	Planning Agency N=51		
1. Academic decisions	1.40 (.40)	1.40 (.40)	1.43 (.41)	1.34 (.38)	1.36 (.36)	1.44	
2. Faculty decisions	1.23 (.58)	1.24 (.60)	1.26 (.59)	1.20 (.55)	1.04 (.34)	2.22	
3. Faculty impacts	1.54 (.75)	1.58 (.77)	1.53 (.74)	1.44 (.74)	1.66 (.75)	1.26	
4. Student impacts	1.64 (.80)	1.66 (.81)	1.67 (.82)	1.57 (.74)	1.44 (.73)	1.61	
5. External impacts	1.19 (.54)	1.18 (.54)	1.24 (.55)	1.09 (.48)	1.10 (.50)	2.80*	

\*  $p < .05$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences in group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.24 Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Initiative for Student Assessment**

Uses and Impacts	All Institutions N=642	State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)				
		Policy & Statute N=136	State Statute N=207	State Policy N=250	No State Plan N=54	F
1. Academic decisions	1.42 (.40)	1.48 (.42)	1.43 (.40)	1.39 (.39)	1.37 (.37)	1.74
2. Faculty decisions	1.23 (.58)	1.28 (.62)	1.26 (.62)	1.20 (.54)	1.11 (.43)	1.40
3. Faculty impacts	1.58 (.75)	1.63 (.74)	1.55 (.74)	1.58 (.77)	1.49 (.73)	.60
4. Student impacts	1.67 (.80)	1.81 (.84)	1.70 (.82)	1.64 (.78)	1.39 (.72)	3.68*
5. External impacts	1.20 (.54)	1.25 (.52)	1.26 (.59)	1.17 (.52)	.95 (.39)	5.49**

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.25 Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment in Public Institutions by State Requirement for Common Indicators and Outcomes**

Uses and Impacts	All Institutions N=703	State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (46 States Including DC)				F
		Common for All N=228	Common for Some N=189	Institution Specific N=195	No Indicators or Outcomes N=99	
1. Academic decisions	1.40 (.40)	1.38 (.40)	1.38 (.41)	1.42 (.41)	1.42 (.37)	.52
2. Faculty decisions	1.22 (.56)	1.23 (.56)	1.24 (.61)	1.19 (.54)	1.19 (.53)	.48
3. Faculty impacts	1.56 (.76)	1.49 (.74)	1.55 (.77)	1.66 (.77)	1.60 (.75)	1.88
4. Student impacts	1.65 (.80)	1.64 (.79)	1.65 (.84)	1.68 (.80)	1.61 (.77)	.19
5. External impacts	1.19 (.54)	1.23 (.56)	1.20 (.56)	1.17 (.51)	1.10 (.51)	1.42

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.



**Table 9.26 Extent of Student Assessment by Accrediting Region**

Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection:  Type, Comprehensiveness and Timing	All Institutions N=1393	Accrediting Region							F
		Middle States N=191	North Central N=529	New England N=87	Northwest N=80	Southern N=423	Western N=83		
1. Academic intentions	3.25 (.98)	3.19 (1.03)	3.25 (.96)	3.14 (1.09)	3.32 (.88)	3.30 (.99)	3.21 (1.02)	.64	
2. Academic progress	3.76 (.55)	3.90 (.37)	3.70 (.59)	3.75 (.58)	3.73 (.45)	3.77 (.54)	3.71 (.66)	3.31**	
3. Cognitive assessment	1.68 (.58)	1.54 (.59)	1.78 (.55)	1.54 (.62)	1.59 (.58)	1.75 (.55)	1.22 (.54)	18.23**	
4. Affective assessment	1.87 (.54)	1.89 (.55)	1.84 (.53)	1.84 (.59)	1.82 (.52)	1.94 (.53)	1.68 (.57)	3.55**	
5. Civic or social roles	1.80 (.89)	1.97 (1.01)	1.77 (.89)	1.84 (.81)	1.57 (.78)	1.82 (.89)	1.63 (.75)	3.26**	
6. Post-college assessment	2.29 (.60)	2.41 (.65)	2.31 (.58)	2.18 (.61)	2.18 (.54)	2.35 (.58)	1.82 (.55)	14.22**	
7. Comprehensiveness of data collection	36 (7)	37 (7)	37 (7)	34 (7)	34 (7)	37 (7)	31 (7)	13.68**	
8. Timing of data collection	19 (5)	18 (5)	20 (5)	18 (4)	19 (5)	19 (4)	17 (5)	4.40**	

\*\* $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.27 Student Assessment Data Collection Methods by Accrediting Region**

Data Collection Methods	All Institutions N=1373	Accrediting Region						F
		Middle States N=186	North Central N=522	New England N=87	Northwest N=79	Southern N=417	Western N=82	
1. Number of instruments	9 (3)	9 (3)	10 (4)	8 (3)	9 (4)	10 (3)	7 (3)	13.40**
2. Transcript analysis	2.16 (1.14)	2.23 (1.19)	2.06 (1.07)	2.30 (1.20)	2.35 (1.20)	2.24 (1.16)	2.00 (1.14)	2.41*
3. External examinations	2.02 (.49)	1.96 (.38)	2.02 (.42)	1.95 (.66)	1.90 (.41)	2.14 (.56)	1.72 (.48)	13.11**
4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students	2.40 (1.00)	2.58 (.99)	2.35 (.98)	2.41 (1.05)	2.27 (.92)	2.46 (1.01)	2.03 (1.03)	4.32**
5. Student-centered methods	1.37 (.30)	1.37 (.32)	1.39 (.30)	1.39 (.30)	1.37 (.26)	1.37 (.30)	1.26 (.32)	2.58*
6. External methods	2.04 (.57)	2.06 (.61)	2.07 (.57)	1.95 (.51)	2.00 (.54)	2.07 (.58)	1.75 (.44)	5.51**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.28 Student Assessment Studies and Reports by Accrediting Region**

Studies and Reports	All Institutions N=1363	Accrediting Region						F
		Middles States N=187	North Central N=519	New England N=81	Northwest N=79	Southern N=416	Western N=81	
1. Number of studies	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	2 (.02)	.32
2. Curricular experience studies	.14 (.18)	.13 (.18)	.13 (.17)	.14 (.19)	.15 (.18)	.14 (.18)	.14 (.18)	.41
3. Co-curricular experience studies	.20 (.23)	.21 (.24)	.20 (.23)	.22 (.25)	.20 (.25)	.21 (.22)	.19 (.23)	.28
4. Conducts no studies	.38 (.48)	.42 (.50)	.40 (.49)	.33 (.47)	.39 (.49)	.34 (.47)	.31 (.47)	1.58
5. Number of reports	2 (1)	3 (2)	3 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)	3 (1)	1.31

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.29 Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment by Accrediting Region**

Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment	All Institutions N=1377	Accrediting Region						F
		Middle States N=190	North Central N=527	New England N=86	Northwest N=79	Southern N=419	Western N=82	
1. Mission emphasis	1.53 (.86)	1.60 (.82)	1.45 (.87)	1.42 (.76)	1.25 (.96)	1.69 (.82)	1.46 (.96)	6.39**
2. Internal purposes	2.50 (.49)	2.49 (.52)	2.47 (.49)	2.46 (.50)	2.39 (.54)	2.59 (.46)	2.39 (.55)	4.85**
3. Accreditation purposes	3.61 (.65)	3.46 (.71)	3.67 (.60)	3.50 (.72)	3.59 (.71)	3.65 (.61)	3.46 (.82)	4.50**
4. State purposes	2.89 (1.18)	2.79 (1.16)	2.75 (1.17)	2.65 (1.28)	2.88 (1.20)	3.24 (1.05)	2.43 (1.30)	12.90**

\*\* $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.30 Assessment Leadership and Governance by Accrediting Region**

Assessment Leadership and Governance	All Institutions N=1381	Accrediting Region						F
		Middle States N=188	North Central N=526	New England N=85	Northwest N=80	Southern N=420	Western N=82	
1. Administrative and governance activities	2.35 (1.22)	2.23 (1.25)	2.44 (1.14)	2.20 (1.34)	2.33 (1.15)	2.29 (1.30)	2.31 (1.31)	1.13
2. Administrator and faculty support	17.05 (2.76)	17.09 (2.63)	17.06 (2.72)	16.55 (3.35)	17.25 (1.94)	17.19 (2.70)	16.48 (3.51)	1.57
3. Formal centralized policy	.50 (.50)	.29 (.45)	.59 (.49)	.24 (.43)	.40 (.49)	.59 (.49)	.32 (.47)	22.07**
4. Institution-wide planning group	.70 (.46)	.64 (.48)	.85 (.36)	.48 (.50)	.71 (.46)	.60 (.49)	.63 (.49)	20.42**
5. Breadth of assessment planning group	4 (2)	4 (2)	4 (1)	3 (1)	4 (1)	4 (2)	4 (1)	7.17**
6. Number approving changes	3 (1)	3 (2)	2 (1)	2 (1)	3 (1)	3 (1)	3 (2)	1.54

\*\* $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.31 Assessment Management Policies and Practices by Accrediting Region**

Assessment Management Policies and Practices	All Institutions N=1363	Accrediting Region						F
		Middle States N=189	North Central N=517	New England N=83	Northwest N=78	Southern N=414	Western N=83	
1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach	.50 (.50)	.35 (.48)	.54 (.50)	.27 (.44)	.40 (.49)	.58 (.49)	.45 (.50)	10.82**
2. Resource allocation practices	1.18 (.46)	1.16 (.45)	1.16 (.44)	1.06 (.25)	1.38 (.57)	1.20 (.50)	1.17 (.38)	2.61*
3. Access to information	3.46 (1.65)	3.63 (1.61)	3.25 (1.72)	3.31 (1.55)	3.36 (1.64)	3.68 (1.56)	3.50 (1.62)	3.93**
4. Distribution of reports	2.43 (1.37)	2.31 (1.41)	2.49 (1.33)	2.07 (1.48)	2.59 (1.62)	2.50 (1.30)	2.20 (1.48)	2.46*
5. Student involvement policies	2.66 (.86)	2.38 (.91)	2.75 (.81)	2.37 (.88)	2.49 (.83)	2.81 (.82)	2.44 (.94)	11.04**
6. Student incentives	1.87 (1.23)	1.64 (1.09)	1.92 (1.21)	1.46 (1.03)	1.94 (1.19)	1.97 (1.33)	1.79 (1.22)	3.58**
7. Professional development policies	1.89 (.79)	1.56 (.59)	1.82 (.81)	2.06 (.90)	1.81 (.77)	2.00 (.77)	1.79 (.77)	6.45**
8. Faculty training required	2.47 (1.56)	2.09 (1.43)	2.41 (1.54)	2.48 (1.47)	2.39 (1.50)	2.79 (1.62)	1.88 (1.28)	10.85**
9. Student affairs policies	1.94 (1.18)	1.77 (1.11)	1.85 (1.10)	1.73 (1.10)	2.19 (1.21)	2.13 (1.30)	1.88 (1.13)	4.54**
10. Faculty evaluation policies	1.24 (.66)	1.36 (.69)	1.16 (.59)	1.19 (.62)	1.26 (.61)	1.31 (.71)	1.17 (.70)	3.88**
11. Hiring process	1.68 (1.10)	1.66 (1.05)	1.66 (1.10)	1.75 (1.18)	1.96 (1.21)	1.71 (1.14)	1.39 (.73)	2.21
12. Encourage faculty to assess	3.99 (1.31)	3.82 (1.38)	4.11 (1.23)	3.95 (1.30)	4.18 (1.07)	4.03 (1.33)	3.25 (1.51)	6.77**
13. Academic planning and review policies	2.79 (.97)	2.40 (1.04)	3.10 (.91)	2.64 (.94)	2.32 (1.03)	2.74 (.91)	2.68 (.99)	16.28**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 9.32 Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment by Accrediting Region**

Uses and Impacts	All Institutions N=1310	Accrediting Region						F
		Middle States N=177	North Central N=504	New England N=79	Northwest N=76	Southern N=398	Western N=79	
1. Academic decisions	1.40 (.41)	1.36 (.40)	1.36 (.40)	1.32 (.38)	1.43 (.40)	1.51 (.40)	1.31 (.41)	8.07**
2. Faculty decisions	1.28 (.62)	1.29 (.59)	1.18 (.54)	1.25 (.60)	1.24 (.53)	1.40 (.69)	1.29 (.72)	6.08**
3. Faculty impacts	1.57 (.77)	1.48 (.76)	1.61 (.75)	1.36 (.73)	1.61 (.79)	1.63 (.77)	1.48 (.82)	2.75*
4. Student impacts	1.62 (.80)	1.55 (.77)	1.55 (.78)	1.36 (.68)	1.65 (.77)	1.80 (.84)	1.62 (.78)	7.06**
5. External impacts	1.17 (.54)	1.10 (.50)	1.13 (.51)	1.07 (.55)	1.17 (.53)	1.27 (.58)	1.13 (.54)	4.46**

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.

**Table 10.1 Correlations of Institutional Approach to Student Assessment and Institutional Use of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Uses of Student Assessment Information											
	<u>All Institutions</u> N=1281		<u>Associate of Arts</u> N=528		<u>Baccalaureate</u> N=305		<u>Master's</u> N=306		<u>Doctoral</u> N=64		<u>Research</u> N=78	
Institutional Approach to Student Assessment	Academic	Faculty	Academic	Faculty	Academic	Faculty	Academic	Faculty	Academic	Faculty	Academic	Faculty
1. Postcollege assessment			.30									.31*
2. Cognitive assessment	.36		.37		.34		.39		.39			.43
3. Affective assessment												
4. Comprehensiveness of data collection	.37		.40		.31		.42		.37			.49
5. Number of instruments	.32		.38		.32							.43
6. Student-centered methods	.32		.37		.34	.31	.31			.39		.39
7. External methods					.30	.31			.36	.48		.37
8. Curricular experience studies	.35		.35		.37	.31	.41		.37	.32		.34
9. Co-curricular experience studies			.32				.30		.36			.40
10. Number of studies	.36		.38		.36		.41		.41			.43
11. Number of reports					.35		.30					

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p < .01$  unless otherwise indicated; only correlations greater than .30 are included in table

\* Correlation is significant at  $p < .05$ .



**Table 10.2 Correlations of Institutional Approach to Student Assessment and Institutional Impacts of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Impacts of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>																		
	All Institutions N=1270			Associate of Arts N=529			Baccalaureate N=303			Master's N=303			Doctoral N=65			Research N=70			
Institutional Approach to Student Assessment	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	
2. Postcollege assessment																			.35
2. Cognitive assessment									.30										.41
3. Affective assessment													.33						
4. Comprehensiveness of data collection									.32				.34						.44
5. Number of instruments																			.31*
6. Student-centered methods																			
7. External methods																			.33*
8. Curricular experience studies	.31						.35	.33		.36	.33		.40	.44	.64				
9. Co-curricular experience studies				.30			.35				.30			.31*	.39				.30*
10. Number of studies	.34			.33			.40	.31		.36	.36		.39	.43	.60				.34*
11. Number of reports															.43				

<sup>a</sup>Fac = faculty impacts; Stud = student impacts; Ext = external impacts

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p < .01$  unless otherwise indicated; only correlations greater than .3 are included in table.

\*Correlation is significant at  $p < .05$

**Table 10.3 Correlations of Institutional Support and Leadership and Governance Support for Student Assessment with Institutional Use of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Uses of Student Assessment Information					
	All Institutions N=1281	Associate of Arts N=528	Baccalaureate N=305	Master's N=306	Doctoral N=64	Research N=78
	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty
<u>Institutional Support</u>						
1. Mission emphasis						
3. Conduct for internal purposes	.40	.37	.43	.43	.30*	.46
4. Conduct for accreditation purposes						
5. Conduct for state purposes	.37					
<u>Leadership &amp; Governance Support</u>						
1. Administrative and governance activities	.32		.40	.32	.30*	
2. Administrative and faculty support	.32	.31	.34	.31		.44

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p < .01$  unless otherwise indicated; only correlations greater than .3 are included in table.

\*Correlation is significant at  $p < .05$

**Table 10.4 Correlations of Institutional Support and Leadership and Governance Support for Student Assessment with Institutional Impacts of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Impacts of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>																	
	All Institutions N=1270			Associate of Arts N=529			Baccalaureate N=303			Master's N=303			Doctoral N=65			Research N=70		
	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext
<u>Institutional Support</u>																		
1. Mission emphasis															.30*			
2. Conduct for internal purposes															.30*			
3. Conduct for accreditation purposes																		
4. Conduct assessment for state purposes																		
<u>Leadership &amp; Governance Support</u>																		
1. Administrative and governance activities	.33			.37		.31	.41								.37*	.30*		
2. Administrative and faculty support																		

<sup>a</sup>Fac = faculty impacts; Stud = student impacts; Ext = external impacts

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p < .01$  unless otherwise indicated; only correlations greater than .3 are included in table.

\*Correlation is significant at  $p < .05$

**Table 10.5 Correlations of Assessment Management Policies with Practices and Institutional Use of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	All Institutions N=1281	Institutional Uses of Student Assessment Information								
		Associate of Arts N=528	Baccalaureate N=305	Master's N=306	Doctoral N=64	Research N=78				
Assessment Management Policies and Practices	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty	Academic Faculty				
1. Resource allocation practices			.31							
2. Budget decisions										
3. Access to information			.32	.32		.30*				
4. Distribution of reports	.31	.34			.32		.42			
5. Student involvement	.33		.40		.45		.34			
6. Student incentives						.57				
7. Professional development	.39	.34	.44	.30	.40	.46	.50			
8. Faculty training required	.30				.40	.37	.34	.41		
9. Student affairs	.39	.40	.41		.36	.51	.37	.40		
10. Faculty evaluation	.35	.61	.30	.63	.44	.64	.33	.55	.63	.72
11. Academic planning and review	.59	.60	.54	.32	.66		.60	.38	.57	

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p > .01$ ; only correlations greater than .30 are included in table.

**Table 10.6 Correlations of Assessment Management Policies and Practices with Institutional Impacts of Assessment Information by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Impacts of Student Assessment Information <sup>a</sup>																	
	All Institutions N=1270			Associate of Arts N=529			Baccalaureate N=303			Master's N=303			Doctoral N=65			Research N=70		
Academic Management Policies and Practices for Student Assessment	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext	Fac	Stud	Ext
1. Resource allocation practices						.32												
2. Budget decisions																		
3. Access to information													.36	.30*	.33*			
4. Distribution of reports												.34						.39
5. Student involvement														.34*				
6. Student incentives													.37	.41	.33*			
7. Professional development				.34			.30						.34					
8. Faculty training required							.32			.30								.30*
9. Student affairs					.30			.33	.31					.48	.40	.44		
10. Faculty evaluation									.35				.50	.61	.48			.37
11. Academic planning and review	.32	.35	.32	.33	.37	.33	.35	.38		.31	.31	.31	.39	.48	.33*			

<sup>a</sup>Fac = faculty impacts; Stud = student impacts; Ext = external impacts

Note: All correlations are significant at  $p > .01$  unless otherwise indicated; only correlations greater than .3 are included in table.

\*Correlation is significant at  $p > .05$

**Table 11.1 Variables used in Regression Analyses**

Variable	Type of Variable	Values	Data Source
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>			
enrollment	item		IPEDS <sup>1</sup>
institutional type	item	Associate of Arts Baccalaureate Master's Doctoral Research	IPEDS
<u>External Influences on Student Assessment</u>			
accrediting region	item (dummied)	Middle States North Central New England Northwest Southern Western	IPEDS
accrediting purpose	item	Scale range <sup>2</sup> = 1-4	ISSA <sup>3</sup>
accrediting influence	item	1 = negative influence 2 = not a factor 3 = either a reason to initiate or to increase involvement 4 = both a reason to initiate and to increase involvement	ISSA
state initiative	item	1 = No state plan 2 = State policy 3 = State statute 4 = Combination of policy & statute	SAS <sup>4</sup>
state approach	item	1 = No indicators or outcomes 2 = Institutional specific 3 = Common for some 4 = Common for all	SAS
state purpose	item	Scale range <sup>2</sup> = 1-4	ISSA

**Table 11.1 continued**

Variable	Type of Variable	Values	Data Source
<u>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</u>			
postcollege assessment	factor	Alpha = .83 Scale range <sup>5</sup> = 1-4 Mean = 2.27	ISSA
cognitive assessment	factor	Alpha = .71 Scale range <sup>5</sup> = 1-4 Mean = 1.62	ISSA
affective assessment	factor	Alpha = .68 Scale range <sup>5</sup> = 1-4 Mean = 1.74	ISSA
number of instruments	additive index	Range = 0-24 Mean = 9.35	ISSA
student-centered methods	factor	Alpha = .61 Scale range = 1-4 <sup>6</sup> Mean = 1.37	ISSA
external methods	factor	Alpha = .63 Scale range = 1-4 <sup>6</sup> Mean = 2.04	ISSA
number of studies	additive index	Range = 0-9 Mean = 2.20	ISSA
number of reports	additive index	Range = 0-5 Mean = 2.47	ISSA
<u>Institutional Support for Student Assessment</u>			
mission emphasis	additive index	Range = 0-3 Mean = 1.48	ISSA
internal purposes	factor	Alpha = .79 Scale range <sup>3</sup> = 1-4 Mean = 2.48	ISSA
administrative and governance activities	additive index	Range = 0-7 Mean = 2.33	ISSA
administrative and faculty support	additive index	Range = 4-20 Mean = 17.05	ISSA

**Table 11.1 continued**

Variable	Type of Variable	Values	Data Source
<u>Institutional Support for Student Assessment</u>			
formal centralized policy	item	1 = yes/ 0 = no	ISSA
institution wide planning group	item	1 = yes/ 0 = no	ISSA
<u>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</u>			
budget decisions	additive index	Range = 0-2 Mean = .08	ISSA
computer support	additive index	Range = 0-3 Mean = .79	ISSA
access to information	additive index	Range = 0-5 Mean = 3.46	ISSA
distribution of reports	additive index	Range = 0-6 Mean = 2.43	ISSA
student involvement	factor	Alpha = .69 Scale Range = 1-5 <sup>7</sup> Mean = 2.66	ISSA
professional development	factor	Alpha = .77 Scale Range = 1-5 <sup>7</sup> Mean = 1.89	ISSA
student affairs	factor	Alpha = .84 Scale Range = 1-5 <sup>7</sup> Mean = 1.94	ISSA
faculty evaluation	factor	Alpha = .77 Scale Range = 1-5 <sup>7</sup> Mean = 1.24	ISSA
academic planning and review policies	factor	Alpha = .84 Scale Range = 1-5 <sup>7</sup> Mean = 2.79	ISSA



**Table 11.1 continued**

Variable	Type of Variable	Values	Data Source
<u>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</u>			
academic decisions	factor	Alpha = .83 Scale Range = 1-4 <sup>8</sup> Mean = 1.40	ISSA
faculty decisions	factor	Alpha = .79 Scale Range = 1-4 <sup>8</sup> Mean = 1.28	ISSA
faculty impacts	factor	Alpha = .79 Scale Range = 1-4 <sup>9</sup> Mean = 1.57	ISSA
student impacts	factor	Alpha = .82 Scale Range = 1-4 <sup>9</sup> Mean = 1.62	ISSA
external impacts	factor	Alpha = .82 Scale Range = 1-4 <sup>9</sup> Mean = 1.17	ISSA

<sup>1</sup>Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

<sup>2</sup>1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = very important

<sup>3</sup>Inventory of Institutional Support for Student Assessment

<sup>4</sup>Assessment of Teaching and Learning for Improvement and Public Accountability: State Governing, Coordinating Board and Regional Accreditation Association Policies and Practices (Cole, Nettles, & Sharp, 1997)

<sup>5</sup>1 = not collected, 2 = collected for some, 3 = collected for many, 4 = collected for all students

<sup>6</sup>1 = not used, 2 = used in some units, 3 = used in most units, 4 = used in all units

<sup>7</sup>1 = not done at all, 2 = done in a few departments, 3 = done in some departments, 4 = done in many departments, 5 = done in most departments

<sup>8</sup>1 = no action or influence unknown, 2 = action taken, data not influential, 3 = action taken, data somewhat influential, 4 = action taken, data very influential

<sup>9</sup>1 = not monitored, do not know, 2 = monitored, negative impact, 3 = monitored, no known impact, 4 = monitored, positive impact

**Table 11.2 External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for All Institutions (N=1393)**

	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.41**</b>		<b>.15**</b>		<b>.26**</b>		<b>.21**</b>		<b>.19**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>										
Middle States										
North Central	-.06*	<.01	-.12**	.01						
New England										
Southern	.06*	.01					.08**	.01		
Western										
State initiative										
State approach										
Accreditation purposes										
State purposes									.06*	<.01
Accrediting Influence										
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>										
Enrollment										
Associate of Arts										
Baccalaureate			.13**	.01	.08**	.01				
Doctoral										
Research										
<u>Institutional Approach</u>										
Cognitive assessment	.09*	.01			.06*	<.01				
Affective assessment										
Post-college assessment										

**Table 11.2 continued**

	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
Number of instruments									.09**	.01
Student-centered methods	.09*	.01	.11**	.03						
External methods			.06*	<.01						
Number of studies	.14**	.06	.10*	.02	.18**	.10	.16**	.04	.11**	.04
<u>Organizational and Administrative Support</u>										
Mission emphasis									.06*	<.01
Internal purposes	.14**	.14								
Admin. & governance activities	.05*	<.01			.13**	.03				
Administrator & faculty support	.06**	<.01								
Formal centralized policy										
Institution-wide planning group			-.06*	<.01	.06*	<.01				
Conducted evaluation	.06**	<.01			.10**	.01	.07**	.01	.07**	.01
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>										
Academic planning & review	n/inc		.11**	.05	.11**	.06	.17**	.11	.11**	.09
Budget decisions			.07**	.01					.06*	<.01
Computer support	.06**	<.01					.08**	.01	.10**	.01
Access to information			.09**	.01						
Distribution of reports	.10**	.02			.09**	.01	.07**	<.01	.08**	.02
Student involvement	.10**	.03							.05*	<.01
Professional development	.11**	.01	.11**	.01	.12**	.02				
Student affairs	.12**	.09					.10**	.02		
Faculty evaluation	.11**	.03	n/inc		.08**	.01	.12**	.01	.12**	.02

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Note: Accrediting region was a categorical variable; Northwest accrediting region was the omitted category. Institutional type was a categorical variable; Master's institutions was the omitted category.

**Table 11.3 External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for Associate of Arts Institutions (N=548)**

	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.41**</b>		<b>.12**</b>		<b>.28**</b>		<b>.22**</b>		<b>.23**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>										
North Central			-11**	.02						
Southern	.12**	.02								
State approach					-.09*	.01				
Accreditation purposes			-.09*	.01	-.12**	.01				
<u>Institutional Approach</u>										
Cognitive assessment	.10*	.09								
Post-college assessment	.08*	.01								
Number of instruments									.09*	.01
Student-centered methods	.13**	.02			.09*	.01				
Number of studies	.16**	.05	.16**	.03	.14**	.06	.14**	.03	.10*	.01
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>										
Internal purposes	.12**	.03								
Admin. & gov. activities					.17**	.04			.12**	.03
Institution-wide planning group			-.09*	.01						
Conducted evaluation					.08*	.01				
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>										
Academic planning & review	n/inc		.15**	.05	.10*	.02	.21**	.13	.13**	.10
Budget decisions									.08*	.01
Computer support	.10**	.01			.09*	.01	.15**	.04	.18**	.05
Distribution of reports	.14**	.02								
Student involvement	.08*	.01							.10*	.01
Professional development			.12**	.01	.17**	.11				
Student affairs	.16**	.14					.13**	.02		
Faculty evaluation	.10**	.01	n/inc		.11*	.01	.11**	.01	.13**	.02

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01

**Table 11.4 External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for Baccalaureate Institutions (N=316)**

R <sup>2</sup>	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
	<b>.40**</b>		<b>.31**</b>		<b>.29**</b>		<b>.24**</b>		<b>.22**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>										
North Central			-.14**	.02						
State purposes			.21**	.02						
Accrediting influence			-.17**	.04					-.12*	.02
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>										
Control (1=pub, 2=priv)			.12*	.01						
<u>Institutional Approach</u>										
Cognitive assessment			.17**	.03					.17**	.02
Number of instruments	.13**	.02								
Student-centered methods			.17**	.02						
External methods			.17**	.06						
Number of studies	.16**	.03			.24**	.14	.19**	.05		
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>										
Mission emphasis					.10*	.01			.11*	.01
Internal purposes	.19**	.09								
Admin. & gov. activities					.21**	.04				
Administrator & faculty support			.13**	.02						
Formal centralized policy							-.12*	.01		
Institution-wide planning group									-.12*	.01
Conducted evaluation			-.10*	.01	.11*	.01	.13*	.01	.16**	.03
<u>Assessment Management</u>										
<u>Policies &amp; Practices</u>										
Academic planning & review	n/inc				.22**	.07	.24**	.12	.16**	.10
Budget decisions					-.11*	.01				
Access to information			.14**	.09						
Student involvement	.16**	.03								
Professional development	.12*	.17								
Student affairs	.12*	.01					.18**	.03		
Faculty evaluation	.18**	.05	n/inc						.14*	.03

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 11.5 External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for Master's Institutions (N=315)**

	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.49**</b>		<b>.20**</b>		<b>.25**</b>		<b>.22**</b>		<b>.23**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>										
Southern			.13*	.01			.16**	.02		
State approach			.17**	.02						
State purposes									.16**	.04
Accrediting influence			.12*	.01						
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>										
Control (1=pub, 2=priv)			-.13*	.02						
Enrollment									.13*	.02
<u>Institutional Approach</u>										
Cognitive assessment	.11*	.01								
Post-college assessment									.12*	.01
Number of instruments	-.13*	.01								
Number of studies	.21**	.11			.24**	.12	.27**	.13	.13*	.03
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>										
Mission emphasis	.12**	.02								
Internal purposes	.21**	.05							.11*	.02
Formal centralized policy			.14*	.01	.14**	.06	.13*	.02		
Conducted evaluation	.19**	.03			.16**	.03				
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>										
Academic planning & review	n/inc		.19**	.06			.16**	.05		
Budget decisions			.18**	.04			.14**	.02		
Access to information	.09*	.01								
Distribution of reports	.09*	.01			.15**	.03			.20**	.09
Student involvement	.11*	.18								
Professional development	.10*	.01	.16**	.02	.14*	.02				
Student affairs	.15**	.05								
Faculty evaluation	.09*	.02	n/inc							

\**p* < .05; \*\**p* < .01

**Table 11.6 External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for Doctoral and Research Institutions (N=145)**

	Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment									
	Academic Decisions		Faculty Decisions		Faculty Impacts		Student Impacts		External Impacts	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.47**</b>		<b>.04**</b>		<b>.34**</b>		<b>.36**</b>		<b>.26**</b>	
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>										
Control (1=pub, 2=priv)	-.15*	.02			-.15*	.05	-.20**	.03	-.23**	.05
<u>Institutional Approach</u>										
Post-college assessment					.17*	.05				
Number of studies	.22**	.07							.35**	.16
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>										
Mission emphasis	-.16*	.02								
Internal purposes	.16*	.02								
Admin. & gov. activities					.26**	.12	.20**	.03		
Administrator & faculty support	.14*	.02								
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>										
Access to information							.18*	.03		
Distribution of reports					.19*	.06	.16*	.05		
Student involvement	.17*	.03	.21*	.04						
Professional development	.28**	.19			.25**	.07				
Faculty evaluation	.26**	.11	n/inc				.42**	.22	.25**	.05

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 11.7 External and Internal Influences on Use of Student Assessment for Academic Decisions by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Type							
	Associate of Arts N=548		Baccalaureate N=316		Master's N=315		Doctoral & Research N=145	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.41**</b>		<b>.40**</b>		<b>.49**</b>		<b>.47**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>								
Southern	.12**	.02						
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Control (1=public, 2=private)							-.15*	.02
<u>Institutional Approach</u>								
Cognitive assessment	.10*	.09			.11*	.01		
Post-college assessment	.08*	.01						
Number of instruments			.13**	.02	-.13**	.01		
Student-centered methods	.13**	.02						
Number of studies	.16**	.05	.16**	.03	.21**	.11	.22**	.07
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>								
Mission emphasis					.12**	.02	-.16*	.02
Internal purposes	.12**	.03	.19**	.09	.21**	.05	.16*	.02
Administrator & faculty support							.14*	.02
Conducted evaluation					.19**	.03		
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>								
Computer support	.10**	.01						
Access to information					.09*	.01		
Distribution of reports	.14**	.02			.09*	.01		
Student involvement	.08*	.01	.16**	.03	.11*	.18	.17*	.03
Professional development			.12*	.17	.10*	.01	.28**	.19
Student affairs	.16**	.14	.12*	.01	.15**	.05		
Faculty evaluation	.10**	.01	.18**	.05	.09*	.02	.26**	.11

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$



**Table 11.8 External and Internal Influences on Use of Student Assessment for Faculty Decisions by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Type							
	Associate of Arts N=548		Baccalaureate N=316		Master's N=315		Doctoral & Research N=145	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.12**</b>		<b>.31**</b>		<b>.20**</b>		<b>.04**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>								
North Central	-.11*	.02	-.14**	.02				
Southern					.13*	.01		
State approach					.17**	.02		
Accreditation purposes	-.09*	.01						
State purposes			.21**	.02				
Accrediting influence			-.17**	.04	.12*	.01		
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Control (1=public, 2=private)			.12*	.01	-.13*	.02		
<u>Institutional Approach</u>								
Cognitive assessment			.17**	.03				
Student-centered methods			.17**	.02				
External methods			.17**	.06				
Number of studies	.16**	.03						
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>								
Administrator & faculty support			.13**	.02				
Formal centralized policy					.14*	.01		
Institution-wide group	-.09*	.01						
Conducted evaluation			-.10*	.01				
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>								
Academic planning & review	.15**	.05			.19**	.06		
Budget decisions					.18**	.04		
Access to information			.14**	.09				
Student involvement							.21*	.04
Professional development	.12**	.01			.16**	.02		

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 11.9 External and Internal Influences on Faculty Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Type							
	Associate of Arts N=548		Baccalaureate N=316		Master's N=315		Doctoral & Research N=145	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.28**</b>		<b>.29**</b>		<b>.25**</b>		<b>.34**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>								
State approach	-.09*	.01						
Accreditation purposes	-.12**	.01						
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Control (1=public, 2=private)							-.15*	.05
<u>Institutional Approach</u>								
Post-college assessment							.17*	.05
Student-centered methods	.09*	.01						
Number of studies	.14**	.06	.24**	.14	.24**	.12		
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>								
Mission emphasis			.10*	.01				
Admin. & governance activities	.17**	.04	.21**	.04			.26**	.12
Formal centralized policy					.14**	.06		
Conducted evaluation	.08*	.01	.11*	.01	.16**	.03		
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>								
Academic planning & review	.10*	.02	.22**	.07				
Budget decisions			-.11*	.01				
Computer support	.09*	.01						
Distribution of reports					.15**	.03	.19*	.06
Professional development	.17**	.11			.14*	.02		
Faculty evaluation	.11**	.01					.25**	.07

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 11.10 External and Internal Influences on Student Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Type							
	Associate of Arts N=548		Baccalaureate N=316		Master's N=315		Doctoral & Research N=145	
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.22**</b>		<b>.24**</b>		<b>.22**</b>		<b>.36**</b>	
	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>ΔR<sup>2</sup></u>
<u>External Influences</u>								
Southern					.16**	.02		
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Control (1=public, 2=private)							-.20**	.03
<u>Institutional Approach</u>								
Number of studies	.14**	.03	.19**	.05	.27**	.13		
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>								
Admin. & governance activities							.20**	.03
Formal centralized policy			-.12*	.01	.13*	.02		
Conducted evaluation			.13*	.01				
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>								
Academic planning & review	.21**	.13	.24**	.12	.16**	.05		
Budget decisions					.14**	.02		
Computer support	.15**	.04						
Access to information							.18*	.03
Distribution of reports							.16*	.05
Student affairs	.13**	.02	.18**	.03				
Faculty evaluation	.11**	.01					.42**	.22

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

**Table 11.11 External and Internal Influences on External Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type**

	Institutional Type							
	Associate of Arts N=548		Baccalaureate N=316		Master's N=315		Doctoral & Research N=145	
	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$	Beta	$\Delta R^2$
<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>.23**</b>		<b>.22**</b>		<b>.23**</b>		<b>.26**</b>	
<u>External Influences</u>								
State purposes					.16**	.04		
Accrediting influence			-.12*	.02				
<u>Institutional Characteristics</u>								
Control (1=public, 2=private)							-.23**	.05
Enrollment					.13*	.02		
<u>Institutional Approach</u>								
Cognitive assessment			.17**	.02				
Post-college assessment					.12*	.01		
Number of instruments	.09*	.01			.13*	.03		
Number of studies	.10*	.01					.35**	.16
<u>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</u>								
Mission emphasis			.11*	.01				
Internal purposes					.11*	.02		
Admin. & governance activities	.12**	.03						
Institution-wide group			-.12*	.01				
Conducted evaluation			.16**	.03				
<u>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</u>								
Academic planning & review	.13**	.10	.16**	.10				
Budget decisions	.08*	.01						
Computer support	.18**	.05						
Distribution of reports					.20**	.09		
Student involvement	.10*	.01						
Faculty evaluation	.13**	.02	.14*	.03			.25**	.05

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$