Table 1.1. Type of publications abstracted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Publication</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpublished Reports</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monograph and Book Chapters</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Articles</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Proceedings</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertations</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2. Nature of Abstracted Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Document</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptive</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains and Dimensions</td>
<td>Definitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National efforts</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-level initiatives</td>
<td>• state governance structure for higher education (consolidated governing board, coordinating board with regulatory authority, coordinating board with advisory capacity, planning agency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• form of student assessment initiative (statute, policy, combination, none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional accreditation association efforts</td>
<td>• student assessment-related reporting requirements (evidence of assessment plan, assessment results, intended or actual uses of assessment information)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• provision of student assessment-related services (resource materials, conferences, workshops, consultation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector (business, foundations) support</td>
<td>• inclusion of employment-related measures in student assessment approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association support</td>
<td>• provision of student assessment-related services (resource materials, conferences, workshops, consultation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent by content</td>
<td>• extent to which institutions collect various types of student assessment data (e.g., cognitive, affective, behavioral)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>• whether student assessment data is collected from students at one or more points in time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment methods</td>
<td>• methods used to collect student assessment data (e.g., quantitative or qualitative, developed by institution or by external sources)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment studies</td>
<td>• nature and number of analyses conducted and reports produced of student assessment data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.3 continued
Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment

| Institutional support strategy | • institutional mission emphasis (undergraduate education, intended educational outcomes, student assessment)  
| | • purposes of student assessment (internal improvement, state or accreditation requirements)  
| Leadership and governance patterns | • leadership and governance activities addressing or promoting assessment  
| | • 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)  
| Assessment management policies and practices | • 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)  
| Assessment culture and climate | • institution’s purposes, values and philosophy related to student assessment  
| | • members’ perceptions and attitudes concerning institution’s student assessment efforts and their role in these efforts  
| Evaluation of student assessment process | • institutional evaluation of student assessment process  

Institutional Context

| Institutional type | • institutional type (associate of arts, baccalaureate, master’s, doctoral, research)  
| Control | • public or private control  
| Size | • institutional size (enrollment)  

Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment

| Use of assessment information in institutional decisions | • influence of assessment information in decisions concerning strategic decisions or academic planning  
| | • influence of assessment information in decisions concerning faculty promotion or rewards  
| Institutional impacts of student assessment information | • impact of student assessment information on faculty behavior and attitudes (e.g., interest in teaching, teaching methods used)  
| | • impact of student assessment information on student performance (e.g., retention/graduation, grade performance)  
| | • impact of student assessment information on institution’s external relationships (e.g., student applications, state funding, institutional reputation)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension of Institutional Support</th>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences on Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National efforts</td>
<td>IIIC1a-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-level initiatives</td>
<td>IIIA1-5, IIIC1c, IIIC2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional accreditation associations</td>
<td>IIIB1-3, IIIC2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector support</td>
<td>IIIC1d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional association support</td>
<td>IIIC2a, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>IA1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>IA1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>IB1-10, IC1-9, ID1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment studies</td>
<td>IE1-10, IF1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support strategy</td>
<td>IIA1-2, IIB1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and governance patterns</td>
<td>IIIC1-7, IID1-6, IIE1-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment management policies and practices</td>
<td>IVA1-4, B1-4, C1-5, D1-6, E1-4, F1-7, G1-7, H1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and climate for student assessment</td>
<td>Not included in this survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of student assessment process</td>
<td>IIF1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>VA1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal impacts</td>
<td>VB1-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External impacts</td>
<td>VB9-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived Variable</td>
<td>Variable Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences on Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td>no derived variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent by Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic intentions</td>
<td>extent1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postcollege assessment</td>
<td>postcol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognitive assessment</td>
<td>cognit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affective assessment</td>
<td>affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic progress</td>
<td>extent10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social roles</td>
<td>extent13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensiveness of data collection</td>
<td>extenttt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timing of data collection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of instruments</td>
<td>instrtt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other student assessment methods</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-centered methods</td>
<td>studmeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external methods</td>
<td>extmeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transcript analysis</td>
<td>othmeth5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external examination</td>
<td>othmeth6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interviews with withdrawing students</td>
<td>othmeth7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student assessment studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricular experience studies</td>
<td>studcur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-curricular experience studies</td>
<td>studcoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of studies</td>
<td>studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student performance profiles or reports</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of reports</td>
<td>reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational and Administrative Support for</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support Strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission emphasis</td>
<td>missemph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal purposes</td>
<td>intpurp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accreditation purposes</td>
<td>purpose1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state purposes</td>
<td>purpose2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other purposes</td>
<td>purpose7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Governance Patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative and governance activities</td>
<td>governin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 2.2 continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership and Governance Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative and faculty support</td>
<td>adminspt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breadth of assessment planning group</td>
<td>grouptot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number approving changes</td>
<td>approvtot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resource allocation practices</td>
<td>resalloc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget decisions</td>
<td>budgfact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer support</td>
<td>infosyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to information</td>
<td>accessin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution of reports</td>
<td>infodist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student involvement</td>
<td>studinv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student incentives</td>
<td>ive2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>profdev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty training required</td>
<td>ivf1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student affairs</td>
<td>staffrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty evaluation</td>
<td>faceval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiring process</td>
<td>ivg6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage faculty</td>
<td>ivg7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic planning and review</td>
<td>planrev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture and Climate for Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no derived variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Student Assessment Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conducted evaluation</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Decision Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic decisions</td>
<td>intdec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty decisions</td>
<td>facdec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Impacts</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty impacts</td>
<td>teachimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student impacts</td>
<td>studimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external impacts</td>
<td>extimp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3  Survey Response by Institutional Type, Control and Accrediting Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>Response Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sent</td>
<td>Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research I</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research II</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral I</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral II</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’ I</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters’ II</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate I</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate II</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1439</td>
<td>885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified[a]</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accrediting Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2524</td>
<td>1393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[a\] 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

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

\(^a\)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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Assessment Data Collected</th>
<th>Extent of Data Collection*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA (N=545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Currently Enrolled Students:</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student academic intentions or expectations</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic college-readiness skills</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher-order skills</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General education competencies</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competence in major field of study</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vocational or professional skills</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal growth and affective dev.</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student experiences and involvement with institution</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student satisfaction with institution</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Student academic progress</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Former Students:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vocational or professional outcomes</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Further education</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Civic or social roles</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Satisfaction and experiences with institution after leaving</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.87)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

*a 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

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Assessment Data</th>
<th>% Institutions Using Instruments from Various Sources$^a$ (N=1393)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student academic intentions or expectations</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic college-readiness skills (reading, writing, mathematics)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher-order skills (critical thinking, problem solving)</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General education competencies</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competence in major field of study</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vocational or professional skills</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal growth and affective development (values, attitudes, social development)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student experiences and involvement with institution</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student satisfaction with institution</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Institutions could select more than one source of instrument for each content area
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Assessment Data and Source of Instrument</th>
<th>Source Used by Institutional Type (% of Institutions)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts (N=548)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate (N=316)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s (N=315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral (N=65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research (N=80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student academic intentions or expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.5 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercially available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.0 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic college-readiness skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.1 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>129.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.5 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercially available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139.3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher-order skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.1 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercially available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.8 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General education competencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercially available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competence in major field of study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.0 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.4 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.6 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercially available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95.3 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.6 continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Vocational or professional skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Personal growth and affective development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Student experiences and involvement with institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Student satisfaction with institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Student Performance Data and Source of Instrument</th>
<th>Source of Instrument Used by Institutional Control (% of Institutions)</th>
<th>Public (N=885)</th>
<th>Private (N=508)</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student academic intentions or expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic college-readiness skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Higher-order skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. General education competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Competence in major field of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.7 continued</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Vocational or professional skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>15.2 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>17.0 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Personal growth and affective development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>55.1 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>24.9 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>10.3 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>39.3 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Student experiences and involvement with institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>26.5 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>11.7 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>22.3 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>29.2 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Student satisfaction with institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.0 *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>58.1 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>20.8 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Alumni satisfaction and experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not used</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionally developed</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>7.1 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State provided</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>64.6 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercially available</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>7.7 **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Institutions could select more than one source of instrument for each content area.

*p < .05; **p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Student Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Extent of Use* by All Institutions (% of Institutions) (N=1393)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Observations of student performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student portfolios or comprehensive projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student performance in capstone courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student interviews or focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transcript analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External examination of students</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Surveys or interviews with withdrawing students</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alumni interviews or focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employer interviews or focus groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Student Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Extent of Use by Institutional Type (% of Institutions)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts (N=539)</td>
<td>Baccalaureate (N=315)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Observations of student</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.72)</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student portfolios or</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comprehensive projects</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student performance in capstone courses</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student interviews or focus</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External examination of</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Surveys or interviews with</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawing students</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.99)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alumni interviews or focus</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.81)</td>
<td>(.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employer interviews or focus</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groups</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.75)</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 1=not used; 2=used in some units; 3=used in most units; 4=used in all units

*b  p < .05;  **  p < .01
Table 3.10  Extent of Use of Other Student Assessment Methods by Institutional Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Student Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Extent of Use by Control*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public (N=875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Observations of student performance</td>
<td>2.21 (.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student portfolios or comprehensive projects</td>
<td>2.00 (.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student performance in capstone courses</td>
<td>1.97 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student interviews or focus groups</td>
<td>1.77 (.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>2.12 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External examination of students</td>
<td>2.06 (.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Surveys or interviews with withdrawing students</td>
<td>2.21 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alumni interviews or focus groups</td>
<td>1.88 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Employer interviews or focus groups</td>
<td>1.97 (.69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Using Different Student Assessment Methods for Special Student Populations</th>
<th>Institutional Type (N=1305)</th>
<th>Institutional Control (N=1366)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. of Arts (N=545)</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate (N=306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Adult students</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Part-time students</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Minority students</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distance education students</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies of Relationship Between Student Performance and the Following Experiences</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Conducting Studies</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1329</td>
<td>N=1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. of Arts N=519</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student course-taking patterns</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Exposure to different instructional or teaching methods</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patterns of student-faculty interaction</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Extra-curricular activities</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Residence arrangements</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student financial aid and/or concurrent employment</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Admission standards or policies</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Academic advising patterns</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Classroom, library and/or computing resources</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do not study the relationship between the above experiences and student performance</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 3.13 Student Performance Reports Provided by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Aggregation of Student Performance Reports</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Providing Reports</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1296</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1363</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. of Arts N=539</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
<td>Master’s N=305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Institution wide</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Schools or colleges</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic programs or departments</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Special populations or subgroups of students</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. By course or groups of courses</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do not provide any reports</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
### Table 4.1 Development of and Influence of Requirements for State Assessment Plans by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development of State Assessment Plan(^a)</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=911</td>
<td>N=963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=963</td>
<td>All N=963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=493</td>
<td>Public N=845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=214</td>
<td>Private N=118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. By state-level officials</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Through joint consultation between state</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officials and institutional representatives</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No statewide plan or requirement for student assessment exists</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square 45.36**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of State Assessment Plan(^b)</td>
<td>N=593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=625</td>
<td>Public N=588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=343</td>
<td>Private N=37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Were an important reason for institution</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiating student assessment</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>18.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have increased institution’s involvement</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in student assessment</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>27.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have not been a factor in institution’s student assessment activities</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>61.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have been a negative influence on institution’s student assessment activities</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square 101.12**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Only institutions receiving state funding responded to this question.  
\(b\) Only institutions reporting the existence of a state requirement or plan for student assessment responded to this question.  
\(p < .05; \quad ** p < .01\)
| State reporting requirements for student assessment include | Institutions (%) Reporting* | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| All N=562 | Institutional Type N=532 | Research N=33 | Institutional Control N=562 |
| N=324 | N=34 | N=117 | N=24 | N=33 | 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 |

* 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review of Student Assessment Plan or Process</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting*</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=605</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=605</td>
<td>Institutional Type N=572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After implementation, institution’s student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment plan or process:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Was reviewed by state-level officials</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Was reviewed by external reviewers</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Required an institutional self-review</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has not been reviewed</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria Used in State Review</strong>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State review of institution’s student assessment plan or process included:</td>
<td>All N=372</td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Review of institution’s student assessment process itself</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comparison of institution’s student performance record with past performance</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comparison of institution’s student performance record with peer institutions</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comparison of institution’s student performance record with other institutions in same state</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

*b 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience with regional accreditation review:</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution has completed a regional accreditation review which required student assessment</td>
<td>N=1304</td>
<td>N=1372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1372</td>
<td>N=539</td>
<td>N=312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional accreditation requirements for student assessment:</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All N=1359</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=533</td>
<td>N=308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Were an important reason for institution initiating student assessment</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have increased institution’s involvement in student assessment</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have not been a factor in institution’s student assessment activities</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have been a negative influence on institution’s student assessment activities</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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 | Baccalaureate 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received grant to improve student assessment practices from:</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1283</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public N=825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=508</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private N=458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca.-laureate N=291</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FIPSE</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other federal agencies</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. State incentive program</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Private foundations or corporate sources</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.96**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No external grants received</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05;  **p < .01
Table 4.7  Use of External Resources for Student Assessment by Type of Provider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of postsecondary organization providing service</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting Use</th>
<th>% institutions using services from this provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of Student Assessment Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Services not used or not available</td>
<td>Consultation services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional associations</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional accrediting association</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-level agency</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consortium of institutions</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% institutions using each type of service</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1 Institutional Mission Emphasis by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Mission Statement Explicitly</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1309</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1376</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=539</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Emphasizes excellence in undergraduate education</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identifies intended educational outcomes for students</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Refers to student assessment as important institutional activity</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does not explicitly mention any of above emphases</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 5.2  Purpose of Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Purpose of Student Assessment</th>
<th>Importance of Institutional Purpose*</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1311</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1379</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1379</td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=544</td>
<td>Bacca- laureate N=312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Preparing institutional self-study for accreditation</td>
<td>3.86 (.65)</td>
<td>3.61 (.66)</td>
<td>3.63 (.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Meeting state reporting requirements</td>
<td>2.89 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.37 (.90)</td>
<td>2.30 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Guiding internal resource allocation decisions</td>
<td>2.71 (.91)</td>
<td>2.83 (.89)</td>
<td>2.62 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Guiding undergraduate academic program improvement</td>
<td>3.43 (.72)</td>
<td>3.38 (.75)</td>
<td>3.51 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Improving the achievement of undergraduate students</td>
<td>3.48 (.71)</td>
<td>3.50 (.70)</td>
<td>3.47 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Improving faculty instructional performance</td>
<td>3.02 (.82)</td>
<td>3.06 (.90)</td>
<td>3.08 (.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative and Governance Activities That Promote Student Assessment</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Engaging in Activities</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1044</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1097</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Annual presidential or institution-wide student assessment initiatives or forums</td>
<td>All N=1097</td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=428</td>
<td>Bacca laureate N=254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rewards or incentives for academic and student affairs administrators who promote unit use of assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Incentives for academic units to use assessment information in evaluation and improvement efforts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assessment workshops for academic and student affairs administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Board of trustees committee that addresses assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty governance committee that addresses assessment issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student representation on assessment committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 5.4 Constituent Support for Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Constituent Group</th>
<th>Extent to Which Group Supports Student Assessment*</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1304</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1370</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1370</td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=538</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate N=313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Board of trustees</td>
<td>3.84 (.93)</td>
<td>3.87 (.95)</td>
<td>3.79 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief executive officer</td>
<td>4.41 (.84)</td>
<td>4.47 (.84)</td>
<td>4.39 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic affairs</td>
<td>4.64 (.69)</td>
<td>4.64 (.71)</td>
<td>4.69 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student affairs</td>
<td>4.33 (.83)</td>
<td>4.38 (.87)</td>
<td>4.33 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty governance</td>
<td>3.80 (.93)</td>
<td>3.87 (.94)</td>
<td>3.83 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Students</td>
<td>3.33 (.74)</td>
<td>3.40 (.76)</td>
<td>3.33 (.80)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Plan or Policy for Student Assessment *</th>
<th>All N=1381</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1312</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1381</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=543</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=314</td>
<td>Master’s N=311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Formal centralization: a plan or policy requiring specified undergraduate student assessment activities of all academic units or programs</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formal limited centralization: a plan or policy for undergraduate student assessment in some academic units or program areas</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal decentralization: a plan or policy requiring all academic units or programs to develop their own undergraduate student assessment plan</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Formal guidance: a plan or policy stipulating institution-wide activities to be conducted by central committee or office</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Informal: no plan or policy but academic units or programs are encouraged to conduct their own undergraduate student assessment activities</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emergent: currently developing a plan or policy for undergraduate student assessment</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. None: does not have an undergraduate student assessment plan or policy</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existence of Assessment Planning Group</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1336</td>
<td>All N=1336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=24</td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=306</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=305</td>
<td>Master’s N=305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=65</td>
<td>Doctoral N=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=69</td>
<td>Research N=69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Has institution-wide planning group for undergraduate student assessment</td>
<td>70.4 72.7 72.5 72.8 61.5 44.9 26.9**</td>
<td>69.2 72.4 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership on Student Assessment Planning Group</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=943</td>
<td>All N=943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=378</td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=223</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=226</td>
<td>Master’s N=226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=40</td>
<td>Doctoral N=40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=32</td>
<td>Research N=32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chief executive officer</td>
<td>13.0 16.9 11.7 7.1 2.5 3.1 19.70**</td>
<td>12.8 13.4 .07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic affairs administrator or staff</td>
<td>85.8 86.0 84.8 87.2 82.5 87.5 .99</td>
<td>85.5 86.3 .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student affairs administrator or staff</td>
<td>54.3 66.9 39.9 46.9 50.0 50.0 48.28**</td>
<td>61.4 42.7 31.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutional research administrator or staff</td>
<td>60.7 67.2 52.9 59.3 60.0 62.5 12.56*</td>
<td>66.2 51.7 19.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic review and evaluation administrator or staff</td>
<td>23.5 23.8 20.2 21.7 30.0 34.4 4.80</td>
<td>24.8 21.5 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student assessment administrator or staff</td>
<td>32.3 36.5 22.4 32.3 37.5 50.0 18.03**</td>
<td>38.3 22.6 24.91**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty</td>
<td>90.9 91.3 90.1 93.4 97.5 78.1 10.55*</td>
<td>90.6 91.3 .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Students</td>
<td>33.1 27.8 38.1 37.6 40.0 31.3 10.24*</td>
<td>33.3 32.7 .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other</td>
<td>11.9 13.0 14.8 8.4 10.0 12.5 4.85</td>
<td>10.6 14.0 2.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive responsibility for institution-wide planning group assigned to following position or functional area</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Reporting</th>
<th>Institutional Type(^{a}) N=911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All N=955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic affairs administrator</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student affairs administrator</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional research officer</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic review and evaluation officer</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student assessment officer</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty member</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | Institutional Control N=955 |
| | | | Public N=596 | Private N=359 | Chi-Square |
| | | | | | |
| 1. Academic affairs administrator | 53.4 | 58.5 | 2.40 |
| 2. Student affairs administrator | 9.6 | 3.6 | 11.65** |
| 3. Institutional research officer | 17.4 | 18.1 | 0.07 |
| 4. Academic review and evaluation officer | 4.7 | 6.7 | 1.72 |
| 5. Student assessment officer | 9.2 | 6.1 | 2.91 |
| 6. Faculty member | 30.7 | 31.8 | 0.12 |
| 7. Other | 12.1 | 8.6 | 2.76 |

\(^{a}\) Only institutions with an institution-wide planning group for student assessment responded to this question

\(^*\) \(p < .05\); \(^{**}\) \(p < .01\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions or functional areas within institution</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Assigning Approval Authority for Student Assessment Plan or Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All N=1305</td>
<td><strong>Institutional Type</strong> N=1240 <strong>Institutional Control</strong> N=1305 <strong>Chi-Square</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=515 Bacca laureate N=301 Master's N=300 Doctoral N=64 Research N=60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public N=825 Private N=480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Board of trustees</td>
<td>17.2 24.3 12.3 11.7 9.4 6.7 37.71** 19.3 13.8 6.4 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief executive officer</td>
<td>45.4 56.5 39.9 37.0 29.7 21.7 57.79** 49.5 38.5 14.5 8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief academic affairs officer</td>
<td>75.3 71.8 76.1 80.3 76.6 88.3 12.97* 74.7 76.5 12.9 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Chief student affairs officer</td>
<td>19.7 28.2 13.0 13.3 10.9 18.3 43.07** 23.8 12.7 23.43**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Institutional research officer</td>
<td>18.2 20.2 20.6 15.0 10.9 18.3 6.73   18.7 17.5 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic review and evaluation officer</td>
<td>8.4 7.4 7.0 8.3 20.3 13.3 15.08** 8.7 7.9 26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Student assessment officer</td>
<td>10.0 12.2 9.3 8.7 9.4 6.7 4.21   12.1 6.5 10.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student government</td>
<td>1.2 4.2 3.7 1.6 -- 20.80** 1.2 1.3 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Academic senate or other faculty committee</td>
<td>38.5 30.1 52.2 47.7 29.7 21.7 58.27** 32.8 48.1 29.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty union</td>
<td>4.4 3.3 7.3 4.7 1.6 -- 11.68* 3.5 5.8 3.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other</td>
<td>13.9 16.3 14.6 11.3 4.7 5.0 12.94* 14.5 12.7 .86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 5.9 Operating Responsibility for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions or functional areas with operating responsibility</th>
<th>Institutions (%) Assigning Operating Responsibility for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All N=1380</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=1313</td>
<td>N=1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=545</td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=313</td>
<td>Master’s N=311</td>
<td>Doctoral N=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic affairs administrator 45.4</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Student affairs administrator 19.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional research officer 45.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic review and evaluation officer 9.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student assessment officer 15.2</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty member 32.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other 12.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. No one 3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 5.10 Reporting Relationship for Operating Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting office for individual with operating responsibility for student assessment</th>
<th>Institutions (% with Operational Reporting Line for Day-to-day Student Assessment Activities)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Type N=1256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts N=524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Chief executive officer</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Chief academic officer</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chief student affairs officer</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institutional research officer</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Academic review and evaluation officer</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 5.11 Existence of Office Providing Faculty Consultation for Using Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control

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

** p < .01
Table 5.12 Institutional Evaluation of Student Assessment Process by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Student Assessment Evaluation</th>
<th>All N=1363</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1295</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1363</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Type N=1295</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Control N=1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc of Arts</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
<td>Master's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Institution has conducted formal evaluation</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institution has conducted informal evaluation</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institution is currently developing evaluation plans</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institution is not evaluating or planning to evaluate assessment process</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>28.69**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of Assessment Process Evaluateda</th>
<th>All N=668</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=629</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=668</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Type N=629</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Control N=668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Student assessment plan and policies</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Structure and responsibility for student assessment</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Achievement of intended objectives for student assessment</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reliability and validity of assessment instruments and methods</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Quality of data analysis</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of assessment information in decision-making</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Problems encountered while conducting assessment activities</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Comparison of costs and benefits of student assessment</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource allocation policies or practices intended to support the collection or use of student assessment information</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1360</td>
<td>Institutional Type N=1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Explicit line item operating budget allocation for student assessment</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic budget process considers student performance indicators informally in resource allocation to academic units</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic budget process compares academic units on student performance indicators and allocates resources competitively among them</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Academic budget process rewards academic units for improvement based on student performance indicators</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 6.2 Student Assessment Information System Policies by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies or practices regarding student assessment information systems</th>
<th>Institutions (%) with Student Assessment Information System Policy or Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Key student assessment activities scheduled into the academic calendar</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Computerized student information system which includes student performance indicators</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student information system tracks students from application through graduation</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student assessment database integrated with faculty, curricular and financial databases</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
Table 6.3 Access to and Distribution of Student Assessment Information by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student assessment information on individual students is available to:</th>
<th>Institutions (%) with Student Assessment Information Policy or Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Institutional research, assessment or evaluation professionals</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Senior academic administrators</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department chairs or academic program administrators</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student affairs professionals</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty advisors</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment reports are regularly distributed to:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic administrators</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student affairs professionals</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Employers</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. General public</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .01
### Table 6.4 Extent of Student Policies on Student Assessment by Institutional Type and Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Policies and Practices on Student Assessment</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1270</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1334</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All (N=1334)</td>
<td>Public (N=849)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=529</td>
<td>Private (N=485)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacca-laureate N=306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s N=302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral N=61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research N=72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students required to participate in student</td>
<td>3.77 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.71 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment activities</td>
<td>3.81 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.88 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.02 (1.29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.66 (1.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.58 (1.37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.79 (1.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.34**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students provided incentives to encourage</td>
<td>1.87 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in student assessment activities</td>
<td>1.72 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.02 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.06 (1.27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.91 (1.16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.83 (1.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.87 (1.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.76**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students provided information regarding purpose</td>
<td>3.52 (1.41)</td>
<td>3.48 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and uses of student assessment</td>
<td>3.49 (1.49)</td>
<td>3.58 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.72 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.42 (1.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.26 (1.32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.99 (1.38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.89**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Students provided individual feedback regarding</td>
<td>3.21 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.26 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student performance results</td>
<td>3.38 (1.49)</td>
<td>3.12 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25 (1.43)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.97 (1.31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.66 (1.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.58 (1.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.31**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a=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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development Policies and Practices on Student Assessment</th>
<th>All N=1338</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1276</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1338</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty required to receive training on student assessment</td>
<td>2.47 (1.56)</td>
<td>2.76 (1.62)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Funds available for faculty to attend assessment conferences</td>
<td>3.08 (1.45)</td>
<td>3.41 (1.48)</td>
<td>3.08 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Workshops or consultative services on use of student assessment offered to faculty</td>
<td>2.90 (1.51)</td>
<td>3.09 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.71 (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Assistance (paid leaves, stipends, course reduction, etc.) provided to faculty to improve use of student assessment</td>
<td>2.00 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.42)</td>
<td>1.89 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Workshops/seminars provided for academic administrators to improve use of assessment</td>
<td>2.55 (1.47)</td>
<td>2.76 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.39 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student affairs staff required to receive training on assessment</td>
<td>2.22 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.51 (1.57)</td>
<td>1.94 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workshops on student assessment provided for student affairs administrators</td>
<td>2.22 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.54 (1.56)</td>
<td>1.87 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a=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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Evaluation and Reward Policies and Practices on Student Assessment</th>
<th>Extent Policy or Practice Exists at Institution *</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1273</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1336</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All N=1336</td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=529</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>laureate N=305</td>
<td>Master’s N=303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Faculty evaluation for promotion considers evidence of student</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty evaluation for salary and merit incorporates evidence of</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student performance</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Promotion, tenure or salary reviews consider faculty scholarship on</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(1.34)</td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Promotion, tenure or salary reviews consider faculty participation in</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Faculty publicly recognized for effective use of assessment</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.06)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty hiring process considers skill in assessment</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.10)</td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty encouraged to assess student learning in classes</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.31)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.33)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F, t</th>
<th>Public N=848</th>
<th>Private N=488</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-4.59**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>-2.57*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-4.56**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-2.32*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution incorporates student performance data into following academic planning and review processes</th>
<th>All N=1336</th>
<th>Institutional Type N=1273</th>
<th>Institutional Control N=1336</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts N=526</td>
<td>Bacca- laureate N=306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic department or under-graduate program planning or review</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. General education or core curriculum review</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.52)</td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Course-level review and development</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review and planning for student academic support services</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.43)</td>
<td>(1.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a 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

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

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions regarding following institutional actions</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1281</td>
<td>N=1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=528</td>
<td>N=850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=305</td>
<td>N=493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Revising undergraduate academic mission or goals</td>
<td>2.06 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.05 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.09 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.07 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.16 (1.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.92 (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51 (1.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.78**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Designing or reorganizing academic programs or majors</td>
<td>2.46 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.61 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.67 (.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.38 (1.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.33 (1.02)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.58**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Designing or reorganizing student affairs units</td>
<td>1.88 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.89 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.93 (1.09)</td>
<td>1.94 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.90 (1.02)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.92 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.97 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.99 (.82)</td>
<td>1.99 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Allocating resources to academic units</td>
<td>1.88 (.96)</td>
<td>1.84 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.77 (.95)</td>
<td>1.74 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.79 (.92)</td>
<td>1.78 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59 (.89)</td>
<td>1.59 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.64 (.82)</td>
<td>1.64 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.41*</td>
<td>2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Modifying student assessment plans, policies or processes</td>
<td>2.70 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.66 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.55 (1.08)</td>
<td>2.52 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.52 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.29 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.29 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.90*</td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty promotion and tenure</td>
<td>1.36 (.73)</td>
<td>1.37 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.70 (.93)</td>
<td>1.70 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.45 (.73)</td>
<td>1.45 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36 (.74)</td>
<td>1.36 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.32 (.58)</td>
<td>1.32 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.03**</td>
<td>10.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Faculty salary increases or rewards</td>
<td>1.30 (.67)</td>
<td>1.37 (.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.49 (.81)</td>
<td>1.42 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.45 (.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34 (.72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.34 (.57)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.23**</td>
<td>4.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Modifying general education curriculum</td>
<td>2.39 (1.06)</td>
<td>2.43 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.57 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.55 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.37 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.36 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26 (.99)</td>
<td>2.26 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.75*</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Modifying student out-of-class learning experiences</td>
<td>2.00 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.05 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.34 (1.07)</td>
<td>2.31 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.22 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.20 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.16 (.95)</td>
<td>2.16 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.05 (.90)</td>
<td>2.05 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.92**</td>
<td>5.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Creating or modifying distance learning initiatives</td>
<td>1.88 (1.02)</td>
<td>1.86 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.52 (.93)</td>
<td>1.47 (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.70 (.94)</td>
<td>1.70 (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66 (.91)</td>
<td>1.66 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.51 (.80)</td>
<td>1.51 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.47**</td>
<td>7.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Modifying teaching methods</td>
<td>2.51 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.48 (1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.43 (.98)</td>
<td>2.47 (.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.51 (.92)</td>
<td>2.51 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.38 (.96)</td>
<td>2.38 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.30 (.95)</td>
<td>2.30 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Modifying student academic support services</td>
<td>2.56 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.57 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.49 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.54 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.56 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.48 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.48 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.48 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.73 (.94)</td>
<td>2.73 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^a\)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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information *</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=1270</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=843</td>
<td></td>
<td>N=487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stimulated campus discussions of undergraduate education</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contributed to faculty satisfaction</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contributed to faculty interest in teaching</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Led to changes in teaching methods used</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contributed to student satisfaction</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affected student retention or graduation rates</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affected student grade performance</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affected student achievement on external examinations</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associates of Arts</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=529</td>
<td>N=303</td>
<td>N=303</td>
<td>N=65</td>
<td>N=70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Stimulated campus discussions of undergraduate education</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Contributed to faculty satisfaction</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contributed to faculty interest in teaching</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Led to changes in teaching methods used</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contributed to student satisfaction</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affected student retention or graduation rates</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affected student grade performance</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.22)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Affected student achievement on external examinations</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.27)</td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>(1.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Impact of Student Assessment Information*</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Institutional Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=1257</td>
<td>N=1319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>Bacca-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=524</td>
<td>laureate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=299</td>
<td>N=300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=64</td>
<td>N=70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Affected student application or acceptance rates</td>
<td>1.40 (1.04)</td>
<td>1.50 (.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td>1.44 (.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>1.51 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.59*</td>
<td>1.46 (.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affected allocation of state funding</td>
<td>1.55 (1.00)</td>
<td>1.43 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>1.57 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>1.66 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.89**</td>
<td>1.64 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Affected evaluation from regional accreditation agency</td>
<td>2.47 (1.40)</td>
<td>2.66 (1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.40)</td>
<td>2.73 (1.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.35)</td>
<td>2.29 (1.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.57 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affected private fund-raising results</td>
<td>1.28 (1.11)</td>
<td>1.44 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td>1.43 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.91)</td>
<td>1.41 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.51**</td>
<td>1.33 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Affected success on grant applications</td>
<td>1.69 (1.18)</td>
<td>1.56 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>1.58 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.11)</td>
<td>1.40 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.63 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Affected communications with external constituents</td>
<td>1.65 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.81 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>1.76 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.24)</td>
<td>1.76 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.76 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affected institutional reputation or image</td>
<td>1.91 (1.29)</td>
<td>1.99 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.30)</td>
<td>1.71 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>1.73 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.97 (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89 (1.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.08 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

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

*italicized questionnaire items did not load on factors
## Table 8.1 continued

### E. Student Assessment Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Factor 6 - Curricular Experience Studies</th>
<th>Factor 7 - Co-curricular Experience Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE2 exposure to different teaching methods</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE3 patterns of student-faculty interaction</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE9 classroom, library and/or computing resources</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE8 academic advising patterns</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE1 course-taking patterns</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment

#### B. Purpose of Student Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose Area</th>
<th>Factor 8 - Internal Purposes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIB4 guiding undergraduate academic program improvement</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB5 improving achievement of undergraduate students</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB6 improving faculty instructional performance</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB3 guiding resource allocation decisions</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB1 conduct for accreditation</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIB2 conduct for state</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. Assessment Management Policies and Practices

#### E. Student Policies on Student Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Area</th>
<th>Factor 9 - Student Involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVE3 students informed about student assessment purpose and uses</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE1 students required to participate in assessment activities</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVE4 students provided individual feedback on assessment results</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IVE2 student incentives*
### Table 8.1 continued

#### F. Professional Development

**Factor 10 - Professional Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVF2 funds for faculty to attend assessment conferences</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVF3 student assessment workshops for faculty</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVF4 faculty assistance for using assessment</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVF5 student assessment workshops for academic administrators</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### G. Faculty Evaluation and Rewards

**Factor 12 - Faculty Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVG1 promotion evaluation includes student performance</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVG2 salary evaluation includes student performance</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVG4 evaluation considers faculty participation in student assessment</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVG3 evaluation considers scholarship on student assessment</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVG5 public recognition for faculty use of assessment</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 11 - Student Affairs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVF6 assessment training required for student affairs staff</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVF7 student assessment workshops for student affairs administrators</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 13 - Academic Planning and Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVH3 course review uses assessment data</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVH1 department or program planning uses assessment data</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVH2 curriculum review uses assessment data</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVH4 academic support service planning uses assessment data</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVH5 academic support service planning uses assessment data</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.1 continued

#### V. Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment

**A. Decision Making**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 14 - Academic Decisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA11 modify instructional or teaching methods</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA2 design academic programs or majors</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA8 revise general education curriculum</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA9 create out-of-class learning experiences</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA1 revise undergraduate academic mission</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA12 modify student academic support services</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA5 modify assessment plans or processes</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA3 design student affairs units</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA4 allocate resources to academic units</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA10 create distance learning initiatives</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 15 - Faculty Decisions**

| |
|-----------------|--|
| VA7 decide faculty salary increases | 0.90 |
| VA6 decide faculty promotion and tenure | 0.90 |

**B. Institutional Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 16 - Faculty Impacts</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VB3 faculty interest in teaching</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB1 campus discussions of undergraduate education</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB2 faculty satisfaction</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB4 changes in teaching methods used</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 17 - Student Impacts**

| |
|-----------------|--|
| VB7 student grade performance | 0.89 |
| VB6 student retention or graduation | 0.83 |
| VB8 student achievement on external examinations | 0.67 |
| VB5 student satisfaction | 0.65 |

**Factor 18 - External Impacts**

<p>| |
| |
|-----------------|--|
| VB13 success on grant applications | 0.77 |
| VB14 communication with external constituents | 0.76 |
| VB12 private fund-raising results | 0.75 |
| VB15 institutional reputation or image | 0.66 |
| VB10 allocation of state funding | 0.61 |
| VB9 student applications or acceptance rates | 0.55 |
| VB11 regional accreditation evaluations | 0.49 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of Survey</th>
<th>Additive Index Label and Variables</th>
<th>Response Scoring</th>
<th>Possible Range of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. Institutional Approach to Student Assessment | **Additive Index 1 - Comprehensiveness of Data Collection**  
1 = not collected  
2 = collected for some students  
3 = collected for many students  
4 = collected for all students  
14 - 56 | **Additive Index 2 - Timing of Data Collection**  
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  
9 - 45 |
| A. Extent by Content | 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 | |
| A. Timing by Content | 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 | |
Table 8.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Student Assessment Instruments by Content and Source</th>
<th>Additive Index 3 - Number of Instruments = [ \sum \text{IB1 to IB10 response score} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IB1 student plans, goals or expectations</td>
<td>1 = yes; 0 = no for each of the following sources of instruments: [ = ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB2 basic college-readiness skills</td>
<td>institutionally developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB3 higher-order skills</td>
<td>state provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB4 general education competencies</td>
<td>commercially developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB5 competence in major field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB6 vocational or professional skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB7 personal growth and affective development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB8 student effort, experiences or involvement with institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB9 student satisfaction with institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB10 alumni satisfaction and experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Student Assessment Studies</th>
<th>Additive Index 4 - Number of Studies = [ \sum \text{IE1 to IE9 response score} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IE1 course-taking patterns</td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE2 exposure to different teaching methods</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE3 patterns of student-faculty interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE4 extra-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE5 residence arrangements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE6 financial aid and/or employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE7 admission standards or policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE8 academic advising patterns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE9 classroom, library and/or computing resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Student Performance Profiles or Reports by Levels of Aggregation</th>
<th>Additive Index 5 - Number of Reports = [ \sum \text{IF1 to IF5 response score} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IF1 institution wide</td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF2 schools or colleges</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF3 academic programs or departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF4 special populations or subgroups of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF5 by course or groups of courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Organizational and Administrative Support for Student Assessment</th>
<th>Additive Index 6 - Mission Emphasis = [ \sum \text{IIA1a to IIA1c response score} ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIA1a emphasizes excellence in undergraduate education</td>
<td>1 = yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA1b identifies educational outcomes intended for students</td>
<td>0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIA1c refers to student assessment as important activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8.2 continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Administrative and Governance Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additive Index 7 - Administrative and Governance Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \text{Activities} = \sum \text{IIC1 to IIC7 response score} ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC1 annual institution-wide initiatives, forums or seminars on student assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC2 rewards/incentives for administrators promoting use of student assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC3 incentives for academic units to use assessment information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC4 assessment workshops for administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC5 board of trustees committee addresses assessment issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC6 faculty governance committee addresses assessment issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIC7 student representation on assessment committees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **D. Support for Student Assessment** |
| **Additive Index 8 - Administrative and Faculty Support** |
| \[ \text{Support} = \sum \text{IID2 to IID5 response score} \] |
| IID2 chief executive officer |
| IID3 academic affairs administrators |
| IID4 student affairs administrators |
| IID5 faculty governance |
| 1 = very unsupportive |
| 2 = somewhat unsupportive |
| 3 = neutral, unknown |
| 4 = somewhat supportive |
| 5 = very supportive |
| 4 - 20 |

| **Additive Index 9 - Breadth of Assessment Planning** |
| **Group** |
| \[ \text{Group} = \sum \text{IIE3a to IIE3i response score} \] |
| 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 |
| 1 = yes |
| 0 = no |
| 0 - 9 |
### IV. Assessment Management

#### Policies and Practices

**A. Resource Allocation for Student Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additive Index 11 - Resource Allocation Practices</th>
<th>( \sum IVA1 ) to ( IVA4 ) response score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVA1 explicit budget allocation for student assessment</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )  ( 0 - 4 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA2 budget process informally considers student performance indicators in academic unit resource allocation</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA3 budget process competitively allocates resources to academic units based on student performance indicators</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA4 budget process rewards academic units for improvement in student performance indicators</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additive Index 12 - Budget Decisions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additive Index 12 - Budget Decisions</th>
<th>( \sum IVA3 ) to ( IVA4 ) response score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVA3 budget process competitively allocates resources to academic units based on student performance indicators</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )  ( 0 - 2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVA4 budget process rewards academic units for improvement in student performance indicators</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Student Assessment Information System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additive Index 13 - Computer Support</th>
<th>( \sum IVB2 ) to ( IVB4 ) response score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IVB2 computerized student information system with student performance indicators</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )  ( 0 - 3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB3 student information system tracks individual students</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVB4 student assessment database integrated with other databases</td>
<td>( 1 = \text{yes} )  ( 0 = \text{no} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Access to Individual Student Assessment Information</th>
<th><strong>Additive Index 14 - Access to Information</strong> = $\sum_{IVC1 \text{ to } IVC5} \text{response score}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment information on individual students available to:</td>
<td>1 = yes 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC1 institutional research or assessment professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC2 senior academic administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC3 department chairs or academic program administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC4 student affairs professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVC5 faculty advisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Distribution of Student Assessment Reports and Studies</th>
<th><strong>Additive Index 15 - Distribution of Reports</strong> = $\sum_{IVD1 \text{ to } IVD6} \text{response score}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment reports regularly distributed to:</td>
<td>1 = yes 0 = no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD1 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD2 faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD3 academic administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD4 student affairs professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD5 employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IVD6 general public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9.1  Number and Percentage of States\textsuperscript{1} with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Differing Governance Structures for Higher Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated</td>
<td>Coordinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing</td>
<td>Regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Differing Initiatives for Student Assessment\textsuperscript{2}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Policy &amp; Statute</td>
<td>State Statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Common Institutional Indicator and Outcomes Requirements\textsuperscript{3}</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common for All</td>
<td>Common for Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} Includes District of Columbia

\textsuperscript{2} Five states did not provide information on this question.

\textsuperscript{3} Seven states did not provide information on this question.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative for Student Assessment</th>
<th>All Inst. N=682</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (46 states)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Combination of statute &amp; policy</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Statute</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policy</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No state plan for assessment</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators &amp; Outcomes</th>
<th>All Inst. N=750</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (44 states)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Common for all</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common for some</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional specific</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No indicators or outcomes</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators &amp; Outcomes</th>
<th>All Inst. N=609</th>
<th>State Initiative for Student Assessment (44 states)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy &amp; State Statute</td>
<td>State Statute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Common for all</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Common for some</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Institutional specific</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No indicators or outcomes</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

*Seven states did not provide information on their indicators or outcomes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection: Type, Comprehensiveness and Timing</th>
<th>All Institutions N=885</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 states including DC)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic intentions</td>
<td>3.22 (.97)</td>
<td>3.22 (.97) 3.18 (.99) 3.24 (.96) 3.43 (.84)</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic progress</td>
<td>3.70 (.59)</td>
<td>3.62 (.62) 3.72 (.58) 3.74 (.58) 3.80 (.46)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>1.62 (.57)</td>
<td>1.63 (.55) 1.69 (.57) 1.27 (.52) 1.68 (.54)</td>
<td>16.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective assessment</td>
<td>1.74 (.49)</td>
<td>1.79 (.49) 1.75 (.50) 1.58 (.46) 1.69 (.43)</td>
<td>4.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Civic or social roles</td>
<td>1.55 (.78)</td>
<td>1.47 (.69) 1.62 (.85) 1.44 (.65) 1.53 (.75)</td>
<td>2.90*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Postcollege assessment</td>
<td>2.27 (.59)</td>
<td>2.27 (.56) 2.35 (.59) 1.96 (.62) 2.28 (.45)</td>
<td>13.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comprehensiveness of data collection</td>
<td>35 (7)</td>
<td>35 (7) 36 (7) 32 (6) 36 (6)</td>
<td>13.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timing of data collection</td>
<td>18 (4)</td>
<td>19 (4) 19 (4) 17 (4) 19 (4)</td>
<td>5.17**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Student Assessment Data Collection:</th>
<th>All Institutions N=682</th>
<th>State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Institutions N=682</td>
<td>State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Policy N=144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic intentions</td>
<td>3.24 (.95)</td>
<td>3.27 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic progress</td>
<td>3.70 (.58)</td>
<td>3.68 (.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>1.64 (.56)</td>
<td>1.74 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective assessment</td>
<td>1.75 (.49)</td>
<td>1.76 (.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Civic or social roles</td>
<td>1.54 (.78)</td>
<td>1.61 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Postcollege assessment</td>
<td>2.28 (.58)</td>
<td>2.33 (.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comprehensiveness of data collection</td>
<td>35 (7)</td>
<td>36 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timing of data collection</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Common for All N=243 | Common for Some N=197 | Specific N=204 | No Indicators or Outcomes N=106 | F |
| 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 (7) | 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>All Institutions N=868</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of instruments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.19 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. External examinations</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.08 (.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students</td>
<td>2.21 (.93)</td>
<td>2.33 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-centered methods</td>
<td>1.30 (.28)</td>
<td>1.30 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External methods</td>
<td>2.06 (.58)</td>
<td>2.11 (.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>All Institutions N=673</th>
<th>State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy &amp; Statute N=141</td>
<td>State Statute N=215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of instruments</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. External examinations</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.93)</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-centered methods</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External methods</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>All Institutions N=740</th>
<th>State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common for All N=241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of instruments</td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>2.12 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.09 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. External examinations</td>
<td>2.05 (.43)</td>
<td>2.02 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Surveys/interviews of withdrawing students</td>
<td>2.21 (.92)</td>
<td>2.07 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-centered methods</td>
<td>1.30 (.28)</td>
<td>1.27 (.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External methods</td>
<td>2.07 (.57)</td>
<td>2.02 (.57)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies and Reports</th>
<th>All Institutions N=872</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Coordinating Coordinating Planning Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governing N=251</td>
<td>Coordinating Regulatory N=461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of studies</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curricular experience studies</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
<td>.14 (.17)</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-curricular experience studies</td>
<td>.18 (.22)</td>
<td>.17 (.22)</td>
<td>.18 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conducts no studies</td>
<td>.40 (.49)</td>
<td>.41 (.49)</td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of reports</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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

* 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

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

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment</th>
<th>All Institutions N=875</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=251</td>
<td>Coordinating Regulatory N=464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission emphasis</td>
<td>1.48 (.90)</td>
<td>1.47 (.93)</td>
<td>1.55 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct for internal purposes</td>
<td>2.48 (.51)</td>
<td>2.53 (.47)</td>
<td>2.49 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct for accreditation</td>
<td>3.59 (.67)</td>
<td>3.65 (.60)</td>
<td>3.58 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct for state</td>
<td>3.29 (.95)</td>
<td>3.32 (.95)</td>
<td>3.45 (.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for governance structure were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission emphasis</td>
<td>1.51 (.90)</td>
<td>1.58 (.90) 1.57 (.89) 1.47 (.93) 1.30 (.87) 1.84 (.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal purposes</td>
<td>2.48 (.49)</td>
<td>2.53 (.47) 2.47 (.50) 2.48 (.50) 2.36 (.48) 1.71 (.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accreditation purposes</td>
<td>3.59 (.67)</td>
<td>3.57 (.64) 3.62 (.67) 3.57 (.68) 3.67 (.66) .48 (.66)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State purposes</td>
<td>3.28 (.95)</td>
<td>3.39 (.89) 3.43 (.89) 3.22 (.96) 2.75 (1.12) 8.73**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01

*Note:* Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state initiative were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment</th>
<th>All Institutions N=742</th>
<th>Indicators and Outcomes (44 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common for All N=241</td>
<td>Common for Some N=194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission emphasis</td>
<td>1.48 (.90)</td>
<td>1.58 (.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal purposes</td>
<td>2.48 (.50)</td>
<td>2.44 (.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accreditation purposes</td>
<td>3.59 (.67)</td>
<td>3.49 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State purposes</td>
<td>3.25 (.97)</td>
<td>3.14 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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) | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
|                                     |                         | Consolidated Governing N=253 | Coordinating Regulatory N=462 | Coordinating Advisory N=108 | Planning Agency N=53 | F |
| 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 (.46) | .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

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Leadership and Governance</th>
<th>All Institutions N=742</th>
<th>State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common for All N=241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative and governance activities</td>
<td>2.36 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.33 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrator and faculty support</td>
<td>17.23 (2.50)</td>
<td>17.06 (2.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Formal centralized policy</td>
<td>.49 (.50)</td>
<td>.42 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Institution-wide planning group</td>
<td>.71 (.46)</td>
<td>.68 (.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Breadth of assessment planning group</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number approving changes</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</th>
<th>All Institutions N=866</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=247</td>
<td>Coordinating Regulatory N=446</td>
<td>Coordinating Advisory N=109</td>
<td>Planning Agency N=52</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach</td>
<td>.51 (.50)</td>
<td>.49 (.50)</td>
<td>.54 (.50)</td>
<td>.47 (.50)</td>
<td>.48 (.50)</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource allocation practices</td>
<td>1.21 (.49)</td>
<td>1.17 (.48)</td>
<td>1.23 (.51)</td>
<td>1.17 (.38)</td>
<td>1.24 (.44)</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to information</td>
<td>3.51 (1.66)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.72)</td>
<td>3.63 (1.61)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.67)</td>
<td>3.36 (1.78)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution of reports</td>
<td>2.52 (1.43)</td>
<td>2.51 (1.42)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.13 (1.11)</td>
<td>3.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student involvement policies</td>
<td>2.65 (.88)</td>
<td>2.70 (.84)</td>
<td>2.70 (.89)</td>
<td>2.36 (.89)</td>
<td>2.62 (.82)</td>
<td>4.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student incentives</td>
<td>1.78 (1.19)</td>
<td>1.68 (1.17)</td>
<td>1.85 (1.23)</td>
<td>1.85 (1.19)</td>
<td>1.63 (.93)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional development policies</td>
<td>1.94 (.80)</td>
<td>1.89 (.81)</td>
<td>1.98 (.83)</td>
<td>1.79 (.64)</td>
<td>2.16 (.72)</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty training required</td>
<td>2.47 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.55 (1.55)</td>
<td>2.52 (1.55)</td>
<td>2.00 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.68)</td>
<td>3.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student affairs policies</td>
<td>2.05 (1.21)</td>
<td>2.15 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.02 (2.21)</td>
<td>1.94 (1.11)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.19)</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty evaluation policies</td>
<td>1.18 (.61)</td>
<td>1.17 (.65)</td>
<td>1.22 (.61)</td>
<td>1.08 (.58)</td>
<td>1.11 (.59)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hiring process</td>
<td>1.70 (1.12)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.17)</td>
<td>1.72 (1.15)</td>
<td>1.42 (1.75)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.15)</td>
<td>2.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourage faculty to assess</td>
<td>3.93 (1.30)</td>
<td>3.90 (1.32)</td>
<td>4.04 (1.24)</td>
<td>3.38 (1.41)</td>
<td>4.19 (1.22)</td>
<td>8.28**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Academic planning and review policies</td>
<td>2.80 (.96)</td>
<td>2.87 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.85 (.96)</td>
<td>2.49 (.89)</td>
<td>2.64 (.80)</td>
<td>4.83**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</th>
<th>State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Institutions N=668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach</td>
<td>.52 (.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource allocation practices</td>
<td>1.21 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to information</td>
<td>3.51 (1.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution of reports</td>
<td>2.60 (1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student involvement policies</td>
<td>2.62 (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student incentives</td>
<td>1.78 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional development policies</td>
<td>1.96 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty training required</td>
<td>2.44 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student affairs policies</td>
<td>2.06 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty evaluation policies</td>
<td>1.19 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hiring process</td>
<td>1.70 (1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourage faculty to assess</td>
<td>3.97 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Academic planning and review policies</td>
<td>2.78 (.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</th>
<th>All Institutions N=736</th>
<th>State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (44 States Including DC)</th>
<th>Common for All N=240</th>
<th>Common for Institution N=195</th>
<th>Specific N=199</th>
<th>No Indicators or Outcomes N=102</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach</td>
<td>.51 (.50)</td>
<td>.48 (.50)          .53 (.50)          .53 (.50)          .47 (.50)          .86 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource allocation practices</td>
<td>1.22 (.50)</td>
<td>1.23 (.54)          1.22 (.51)          1.25 (.51)          1.15 (.50)          .63 (.50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to information</td>
<td>3.50 (1.66)</td>
<td>3.58 (.69)          3.43 (.69)          3.57 (.60)          3.35 (.69)          .70 (.69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution of reports</td>
<td>2.54 (1.40)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.47)         2.55 (1.40)         2.65 (1.41)         2.37 (1.41)         .90 (1.41)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student involvement policies</td>
<td>2.64 (.88)</td>
<td>2.60 (.93)          2.80 (.87)          2.62 (.83)          2.51 (.84)          2.24 (.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student incentives</td>
<td>1.77 (1.18)</td>
<td>1.73 (1.16)         1.85 (1.18)         1.84 (1.32)         1.55 (1.32)         1.83 (1.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional development policies</td>
<td>1.96 (.81)</td>
<td>1.79 (.74)          1.98 (.83)          2.09 (.87)          2.03 (.70)          5.55** (1.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty training required</td>
<td>2.45 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.41)         2.48 (1.57)         2.59 (1.58)         2.55 (1.57)         2.17 (1.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student affairs policies</td>
<td>2.07 (1.21)</td>
<td>1.99 (1.17)         2.21 (1.28)         2.09 (1.23)         1.93 (1.23)         1.60 (1.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty evaluation policies</td>
<td>1.17 (.59)</td>
<td>1.23 (1.60)         1.18 (1.61)         1.15 (1.58)         1.08 (1.58)         1.62 (1.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Hiring process</td>
<td>1.70 (1.11)</td>
<td>1.54 (1.91)         1.75 (1.16)         1.87 (1.29)         1.67 (1.29)         3.32* (1.29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Encourage faculty to assess</td>
<td>3.91 (1.30)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.34)         3.85 (1.36)         4.11 (1.22)         4.05 (1.22)         3.50* (1.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Academic planning and review policies</td>
<td>2.79 (.94)</td>
<td>2.74 (.93)          2.79 (.96)          2.89 (.97)          2.72 (.97)          1.06 (.97)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for state requirements were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses and Impacts</th>
<th>All Institutions N=827</th>
<th>State Governance Structure (51 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Governing N=241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic decisions</td>
<td>1.40 (.40)</td>
<td>1.40 (.40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty decisions</td>
<td>1.23 (.58)</td>
<td>1.24 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty impacts</td>
<td>1.54 (.75)</td>
<td>1.58 (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student impacts</td>
<td>1.64 (.80)</td>
<td>1.66 (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. External impacts</td>
<td>1.19 (.54)</td>
<td>1.18 (.54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses and Impacts</th>
<th>All Institutions N=642</th>
<th>State Initiative for Student Assessment (46 States Including DC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy &amp; Statute N=136</td>
<td>State Statute N=207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic decisions</td>
<td>1.42 (.40)</td>
<td>1.48 (.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty decisions</td>
<td>1.23 (.58)</td>
<td>1.28 (.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty impacts</td>
<td>1.58 (.75)</td>
<td>1.63 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student impacts</td>
<td>1.67 (.80)</td>
<td>1.81 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External impacts</td>
<td>1.20 (.54)</td>
<td>1.25 (.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses and Impacts</th>
<th>All Institutions N=703</th>
<th>State Indicators and Outcomes Requirement (46 States Including DC)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common for All N=228</td>
<td>Common for Some N=189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic decisions</td>
<td>1.40 (.40)</td>
<td>1.38 (.40)</td>
<td>1.38 (.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty decisions</td>
<td>1.22 (.56)</td>
<td>1.23 (.56)</td>
<td>1.24 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty impacts</td>
<td>1.56 (.76)</td>
<td>1.49 (.74)</td>
<td>1.55 (.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Student impacts</td>
<td>1.65 (.80)</td>
<td>1.64 (.79)</td>
<td>1.65 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. External impacts</td>
<td>1.19 (.54)</td>
<td>1.23 (.56)</td>
<td>1.20 (.56)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Student Assessment</th>
<th>All Institutions N=1393</th>
<th>Accrediting Region</th>
<th>Middle States N=191</th>
<th>North Central N=529</th>
<th>New England N=87</th>
<th>Northwest N=80</th>
<th>Southern N=423</th>
<th>Western N=83</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic intentions</td>
<td>3.25 (.98)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.19 (.103)</td>
<td>3.25 (.96)</td>
<td>3.14 (.109)</td>
<td>3.32 (.88)</td>
<td>3.30 (.99)</td>
<td>3.21 (.102)</td>
<td>.64 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic progress</td>
<td>3.76 (.55)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90 (.37)</td>
<td>3.70 (.59)</td>
<td>3.75 (.58)</td>
<td>3.73 (.45)</td>
<td>3.77 (.54)</td>
<td>3.71 (.66)</td>
<td>3.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>1.68 (.58)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54 (.59)</td>
<td>1.78 (.55)</td>
<td>1.54 (.62)</td>
<td>1.59 (.58)</td>
<td>1.75 (.55)</td>
<td>1.22 (.54)</td>
<td>18.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Affective assessment</td>
<td>1.87 (.54)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.89 (.55)</td>
<td>1.84 (.55)</td>
<td>1.84 (.62)</td>
<td>1.82 (.58)</td>
<td>1.94 (.55)</td>
<td>1.68 (.54)</td>
<td>3.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Civic or social roles</td>
<td>1.80 (.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.97 (.101)</td>
<td>1.77 (.89)</td>
<td>1.84 (.81)</td>
<td>1.84 (.78)</td>
<td>1.92 (.89)</td>
<td>1.63 (.75)</td>
<td>3.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Post-college assessment</td>
<td>2.29 (.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.41 (.65)</td>
<td>2.31 (.58)</td>
<td>2.18 (.61)</td>
<td>2.18 (.54)</td>
<td>2.35 (.58)</td>
<td>1.82 (.55)</td>
<td>14.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comprehensiveness of data collection</td>
<td>36 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (7)</td>
<td>37 (7)</td>
<td>34 (7)</td>
<td>34 (7)</td>
<td>37 (7)</td>
<td>31 (7)</td>
<td>13.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Timing of data collection</td>
<td>19 (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (5)</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>18 (4)</td>
<td>19 (5)</td>
<td>19 (4)</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
<td>4.40**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection Methods</th>
<th>All Institutions N=1373</th>
<th>Accrediting Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle States N=186</td>
<td>North Central N=522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North England N=87</td>
<td>Northwest N=79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern N=417</td>
<td>Western N=82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of instruments</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
<td>9 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 (3)</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (4)</td>
<td>10 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transcript analysis</td>
<td>2.16 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.23 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. External examinations</td>
<td>2.02 (.49)</td>
<td>1.96 (.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.02)</td>
<td>(.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Surveys/interviews of</td>
<td>2.40 (1.00)</td>
<td>2.58 (.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawing students</td>
<td>(2.35)</td>
<td>(.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.41)</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
<td>(.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.46)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.03)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-centered methods</td>
<td>1.37 (.30)</td>
<td>1.37 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.26)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. External methods</td>
<td>2.04 (.57)</td>
<td>2.06 (.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.95)</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.00)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.07)</td>
<td>(.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05, **p < .01

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Studies and Reports</th>
<th>All Institutions N=1363</th>
<th>Middles States N=187</th>
<th>North Central States N=519</th>
<th>New England N=81</th>
<th>Northwest N=79</th>
<th>Southern N=416</th>
<th>Western N=81</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of studies</td>
<td>2 (.2)</td>
<td>2 (.13)</td>
<td>2 (.14)</td>
<td>2 (.15)</td>
<td>2 (.14)</td>
<td>2 (.14)</td>
<td>2 (.14)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Curricular experience studies</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
<td>.13 (.18)</td>
<td>.13 (.17)</td>
<td>.14 (.19)</td>
<td>.15 (.18)</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Co-curricular experience studies</td>
<td>.20 (.23)</td>
<td>.21 (.24)</td>
<td>.20 (.23)</td>
<td>.22 (.25)</td>
<td>.20 (.25)</td>
<td>.21 (.22)</td>
<td>.19 (.23)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conducts no studies</td>
<td>.38 (.48)</td>
<td>.42 (.50)</td>
<td>.40 (.49)</td>
<td>.33 (.47)</td>
<td>.39 (.49)</td>
<td>.34 (.47)</td>
<td>.31 (.47)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of reports</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Standard deviations are in parentheses. Differences across group means for accrediting region were estimated using one-way ANOVA.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Support Strategy for Student Assessment</th>
<th>All Institutions N=1377</th>
<th>Middle States N=190</th>
<th>North Central N=527</th>
<th>New England N=86</th>
<th>Northwest N=79</th>
<th>Southern N=419</th>
<th>Western N=82</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission emphasis</td>
<td>1.53 (.86)</td>
<td>1.60 (.82)</td>
<td>1.45 (.87)</td>
<td>1.42 (.76)</td>
<td>1.25 (.96)</td>
<td>1.69 (.82)</td>
<td>1.69 (.96)</td>
<td>6.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Internal purposes</td>
<td>2.50 (.49)</td>
<td>2.49 (.52)</td>
<td>2.47 (.49)</td>
<td>2.46 (.50)</td>
<td>2.39 (.54)</td>
<td>2.59 (.46)</td>
<td>2.39 (.55)</td>
<td>4.85**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accreditation purposes</td>
<td>3.61 (.65)</td>
<td>3.46 (.71)</td>
<td>3.67 (.60)</td>
<td>3.50 (.72)</td>
<td>3.59 (.71)</td>
<td>3.65 (.61)</td>
<td>3.46 (.82)</td>
<td>4.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State purposes</td>
<td>2.89 (1.18)</td>
<td>2.79 (1.16)</td>
<td>2.75 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.88 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.43 (1.30)</td>
<td>12.90**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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

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

**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</th>
<th>All Institutions N=1363</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conducted evaluation of assessment approach</td>
<td>(.50)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Resource allocation practices</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to information</td>
<td>(.65)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution of reports</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student involvement policies</td>
<td>(.86)</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student incentives</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional development policies</td>
<td>(.79)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty training required</td>
<td>(.56)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student affairs policies</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty evaluation policies</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Academic planning and review policies</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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

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

* 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

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

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

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

*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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Institutions N=1270</th>
<th>Associate of Arts N=529</th>
<th>Baccalaureate N=303</th>
<th>Master’s N=303</th>
<th>Doctoral N=65</th>
<th>Research N=70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
<td>Fac Stud Ext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Mission emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conduct for internal purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct for accreditation purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct assessment for state purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership &amp; Governance Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Administrative and governance activities</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Administrative and faculty support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fac = faculty impacts; Stud = student impacts; Ext = external impacts

*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

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

*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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Management Policies and Practices</th>
<th>Institutional Impacts of Student Assessment Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Institutions N=1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Resource allocation practices</td>
<td>Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budget decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Access to information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Distribution of reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional development</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Faculty training required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student affairs</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Academic planning and review</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Type of Variable</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enrollment item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>IPEDS^1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutional type item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences on Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrediting region item</td>
<td>item (dummied)</td>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td>IPEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrediting purpose item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>Scale range^2 = 1-4</td>
<td>ISSA^3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accrediting influence item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1 = negative influence</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = not a factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = either a reason to initiate or to increase involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = both a reason to initiate and to increase involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state initiative item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1 = No state plan</td>
<td>SAS^4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = State policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = State statute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Combination of policy &amp; statute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state approach item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1 = No indicators or outcomes</td>
<td>SAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Institutional specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Common for some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 = Common for all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state purpose item</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>Scale range^2 = 1-4</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Type of Variable</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach to Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>postcollege assessment factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .83</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognitive assessment factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .71</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affective assessment factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .68</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of instruments additive index</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-24</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 9.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student-centered methods factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .61</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external methods factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .63</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of studies additive index</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-9</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>number of reports additive index</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-5</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support for Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission emphasis additive index</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-3</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internal purposes factor</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .79</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale range = 1-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative and governance activities</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-7</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administrative and faculty support additive index</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 4-20</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 17.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Type of Variable</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Support for Student Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal centralized policy</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1 = yes/ 0 = no</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution wide planning group</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1 = yes/ 0 = no</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Management Policies and Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budget decisions</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-2</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = .08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>computer support</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-3</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = .79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>access to information</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-5</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 3.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distribution of reports</td>
<td>additive index</td>
<td>Range = 0-6</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student involvement</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .69</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Range = 1-5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .77</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Range = 1-5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student affairs</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .84</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Range = 1-5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty evaluation</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .77</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Range = 1-5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic planning and review policies</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>Alpha = .84</td>
<td>ISSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scale Range = 1-5'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean = 2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Type of Variable</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Data Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| academic decisions | factor | Alpha = .83  
Scale Range = 1-4  
Mean = 1.40 | ISSA |
| faculty decisions | factor | Alpha = .79  
Scale Range = 1-4  
Mean = 1.28 | ISSA |
| faculty impacts | factor | Alpha = .79  
Scale Range = 1-4  
Mean = 1.57 | ISSA |
| student impacts | factor | Alpha = .82  
Scale Range = 1-4  
Mean = 1.62 | ISSA |
| external impacts | factor | Alpha = .82  
Scale Range = 1-4  
Mean = 1.17 | ISSA |

1 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System  
2 1 = no importance, 2 = minor importance, 3 = moderate importance, 4 = very important  
3 Inventory of Institutional Support for Student Assessment  
5 1= not collected, 2 = collected for some, 3 = collected for many, 4 = collected for all students  
6 1 = not used, 2 = used in some units, 3 = used in most units, 4 = used in all units  
7 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  
8 1 = no action or influence unknown, 2 = action taken, data not influential, 3 = action taken, data somewhat influential, 4 = action taken, data very influential  
9 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.41***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting Influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11.2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instruments</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered methods</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External methods</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission emphasis</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; governance activities</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator &amp; faculty support</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal centralized policy</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-wide planning group</td>
<td>-.06*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>.06**</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered methods</td>
<td>.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbizational &amp; Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; gov. activities</td>
<td>-09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-wide planning group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td>.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.10**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 11.4  External and Internal Influences on Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment for Baccalaureate Institutions (N=316)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences</th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>-.14** .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State purposes</td>
<td>.21** .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting influence</td>
<td>-.17** .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12* .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=pub, 2=priv)</td>
<td>.12* .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Approach</th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>.13** .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17** .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External methods</td>
<td>.17** .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.16** .03</td>
<td>.24** .14</td>
<td>.19** .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission emphasis</td>
<td>.10* .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.11* .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>.19** .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; gov. activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.21** .04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator &amp; faculty support</td>
<td>.13** .02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal centralized policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-wide planning group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>-.10* .01</td>
<td>.11* .01</td>
<td>.13* .01</td>
<td>.16** .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Management</th>
<th>Academic Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Decisions</th>
<th>Faculty Impacts</th>
<th>Student Impacts</th>
<th>External Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
<td>.22** .07</td>
<td>.24** .12</td>
<td>.16** .10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11* .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14** .09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>.16** .03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.12* .17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>.12* .01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18** .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.18** .05</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14* .03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences</th>
<th>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2$ Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td>.49** .13* .17** .12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State purposes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=pub, 2=priv)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>-.13* .02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>.11* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instruments</td>
<td>-.13* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.21** .11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>.21** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>.19** .03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>.09* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td>.09* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>.11* .18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.10* .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>.15** .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.09* .02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>Institutional Uses and Impacts of Student Assessment</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=pub, 2=priv)</td>
<td>Academic Decisions</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td>Faculty Decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>Student Impacts</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</td>
<td>Institutional Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission emphasis</td>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td>Admin. &amp; gov. activities</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator &amp; faculty support</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>n/inc</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>AR²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>AR²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>AR²</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>AR²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>Doctoral &amp; Research</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=548</td>
<td>N=316</td>
<td>N=315</td>
<td>N=145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institutional Characteristics**

- Control (1=public, 2=private)  
  - .15* .02

**Institutional Approach**

- Cognitive assessment  
  - .10* .09
- Post-college assessment  
  - .08* .01
- Number of instruments  
  - .13** .02
- Student-centered methods  
  - .13** .02
- Number of studies  
  - .16** .05

**Organizational & Administrative Support**

- Mission emphasis  
  - .12** .02
- Internal purposes  
  - .12** .03
- Administrator & faculty support  
  - .19** .09
- Conducted evaluation  
  - .19** .03

**Assessment Management Policies & Practices**

- Computer support  
  - .10** .01
- Access to information  
  - .14** .02
- Distribution of reports  
  - .08* .01
- Student involvement  
  - .16** .03
- Professional development  
  - .12* .17
- Student affairs  
  - .16** .14
- Faculty evaluation  
  - .10** .01

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 11.8  External and Internal Influences on Use of Student Assessment for Faculty Decisions by Institutional Type

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

*p < .05; **p < .01
### Table 11.9 External and Internal Influences on Faculty Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Associate of Arts</th>
<th>Baccalaureate</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Doctoral &amp; Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N=548</td>
<td>N=316</td>
<td>N=315</td>
<td>N=145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>0.28**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.12**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR^2</strong></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State approach</td>
<td>-.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation purposes</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=public, 2=private)</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-centered methods</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; governance activities</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal centralized policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15** 0.03 0.19* 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25** 0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 11.10  External and Internal Influences on Student Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th>Associate of Arts N=548</th>
<th>Baccalaureate N=316</th>
<th>Master’s N=315</th>
<th>Doctoral &amp; Research N=145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Influences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
<td>Beta AR²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=public, 2=private)</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational &amp; Administrative Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; governance activities</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal centralized policy</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Management Policies &amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05; **p < .01
Table 11.11  External and Internal Influences on External Impacts of Student Assessment by Institutional Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Influences</th>
<th>Institutional Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Associate of Arts</td>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>Doctoral &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=548</td>
<td>N=316</td>
<td>N=315</td>
<td>N=145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beta</strong></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AR²</strong></td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrediting influence</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (1=public, 2=private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Approach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive assessment</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-college assessment</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instruments</td>
<td>.09*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of studies</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational &amp; Administrative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission emphasis</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. &amp; governance activities</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution-wide group</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted evaluation</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment Management Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic planning &amp; review</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget decisions</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student involvement</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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