The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) represents a mechanism whereby members of the Big Ten Conference institutions and the University of Illinois-Chicago can meet to discuss a wide variety of issues related to the operations of member institutions. Among the numerous conferences established by the CIC is the Governance Meeting which is designed to address issues related to the academic governance organizations concerns of member institutions. The 2007 CIC Governance Meeting was held at the University of Iowa on November 2-3. The MSU representatives to the meeting were Harold Hughes, At-Large Member of the Executive Committee of Academic Council (School of Packaging) and John Powell, Chair of the University Committee on Faculty Affairs (Kinesiology) (See attached group members list. Not all group members were in attendance). This year’s agenda included discussions of presidential search procedures, intercollegiate athletics, Institutional Review Boards, University fringe benefits, accountability in higher education and affirmative action (See attached agenda). The following items provide an overview of the discussion and commentary by the MSU representatives.

- **In the Sunshine or the Moonlight? (Presidential Searches)**

  The discussion was lead by representatives from the University of Iowa who recently selected a new president. The issue at hand related to whether presidential searches should be conducted in the moonlight where the process is conducted by governing boards and private search firms or in the sunshine where the university community, especially faculty, is openly involved in the process. Members provided descriptions of the search processes most recently conducted at their institutions. The general opinion of the members was that successful presidential searches are conducted in the “sunshine” and that the faculties are a critical element in the process. It was interesting to note the variations in the search process related to the nature of the governing boards, i.e., appointed members versus elected members, with appointed members more likely to opt for “moonlight” or even “in the dark” searches.

- **Are Intercollegiate Athletics Too Important for Faculty Governance?**

  The recent COIA Proposal on Reforms in Intercollegiate Athletics was the focus of the discussion. Members of the panel included current and
former faculty athletic representatives and COIA representatives. The
discussion focused on the role of faculty in academic issues related to the
student-athlete. One of the panelists asked specific questions regarding
NCAA, Big Ten and institutional aspects of intercollegiate athletics. It
was apparent from the members present that there is a wide range of
knowledge within the faculty regarding how their institutions address
academic issues related to student-athletes. There was general agreement
that faculty governance must be better informed of these areas and should
be an active participant in ensuring that student-athletes are successful in
the classroom.

• IRB: The Devil is in the Details
There was discussion related to the function of the Institutional Review
Boards (IRB) as they seek to provide protection for the subjects that
participate in research conducted by the faculty in the University. The
panelists presented information regarding their guidelines and regulations
as they apply to the operations of the IRB. They also pointed the wide
variety of topics, research designs and applicant experiences that they
review, e.g., senior faculty, junior faculty, graduate students and
undergraduate students. As with governance, the CIC conducts
conferences of the chairs of the member IRB. One of the issues that will
be discussed at this year’s meeting will be procedures for inter-
institutional cooperation regarding multiple site projects conducted among
the IRB accredited institutions in the CIC.

• Are Fringe Benefits Sinking University Finances?
This topic elicited a very active participation by the members. It was clear
from the discussion that the issue of the cost of benefits programs and
their impact on the financial health of the institution is a major concern.
Each institution approaches the issue differently within the constraints of
both the national debate and local program designs. It was agreed that the
issue of fringe benefits, especially those related to health care, are
extremely complex and that identifying specific solutions is an onerous
task. In many cases, the faculty among the CIC members has had very
limited participation in the local debate. The MSU faculty has taken an
assertive and proactive approach to its participation in these important
discussions.

o Where Should the Faculty Stand? Accountability in Higher Education

The member heard a presentation by Daniel Fogel, President of the
University of Vermont regarding his leadership in a project to establish a
Voluntary System of Accountability (VSR). This project would produce a
web-based system where colleges and universities can present their
information regarding their academic programs in both a uniform way
across institutions as well as details regarding the value-added nature of
their academic programs (See attached template). The project is pilot
study to address the issue of accountability in higher education that was
inherent in the recent Spellings Report. This pilot project is in beta test currently with an anticipated roll out, for those institutions that would like to participate, in early 2008.

• **Is Affirmative Action History?**

The panelist presented an overview of the approach that their institutions have taken or are taking to address the issue of diversity and inclusion. There is concern among the CIC members regarding the impact on their programs of the growing movement to abolish affirmative action in its traditional form. There is continuing uncertainty among the CIC institutions with regard to the idea of “who is next” to be targeted for a “Michigan style” constitutional amendment. It was clear from the discussion that all CIC members maintain a deep commitment to the principles of diversity and inclusion as these principles represent core values within their missions. It was especially rewarding when one of the panelists cited the MSU programs for diversity and inclusion as exemplars in the area of faculty development.
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AGENDA

The Iowa Memorial Union
Meetings will be held in South Room

Thursday, November 1

7:00-10:00 p.m.  Informal Reception
Home of Michael O'Hara, Vice President, UI Faculty Senate (casual dress)
Transportation provided between the Iowa House Hotel and Professor O'Hara's home

Friday, November 2

8:00-9:00 a.m.  Buffet Breakfast, North Room
Welcome and Comments by Interim Provost Lola Lopes at 8:45 am

9:00-10:30 a.m.  In the Sunshine or the Moonlight? (Presidential Searches)
Discussion Facilitators:
  Jon Carlson, College of Law, University of Iowa
  Sheldon Kurtz, College of Law, University of Iowa

10:30-10:45 a.m.  Break

10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m. Are Intercollegiate Athletics Too Important for Faculty Governance?
Discussion Facilitator:
  Steve McGuire, College of Education, University of Iowa
Panelists:
  Charles Lynch, College of Medicine, University of Iowa
  Elizabeth Altmair, College of Education, University of Iowa
  Bonnie Slatton, University of Iowa
  Charles Smith, University of Michigan
  Gary Engstrand, University of Minnesota

12:15-1:00 p.m.  Lunch, North Room, IMU
1:00-1:45 p.m.  Presentation and Tour, Old Capitol Museum

1:45-3:15 p.m.  IRB: The Devil is in the Details
Discussion Facilitator:
  Michael O’Hara, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Iowa
Panelists:
Kim Graber, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Kristine Fitch, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, University of Iowa
Bill Hubbard, IRB Office, University of Iowa
Martha Jones, IRB Office, University of Iowa

This session will address IRB issues that arise principally in non-health science contexts. The session will be focused on issues that arise when reviewing protocols coming out of the humanities and social sciences, disciplines that may not have the same tradition of thinking of their work as research involving human subjects as disciplines in medicine and psychology. In addition, the session will address problems that the basic sciences faculty members have in getting applications through in a timely fashion. Please survey your faculty colleagues before the meeting to identify issues that you would like addressed. A CIC IRB administrators meeting will occur the next weekend, so our discussion can have an impact on all of our CIC institutions.

3:15-3:30 p.m.  Break

3:30-5:00 p.m.  Are Fringe Benefits Sinking University Finances?
Discussion Facilitator:
    Sheldon Kurtz, College of Law, University of Iowa

5:30-6:00 p.m.  Campus Bus Tour

6:00-7:00 p.m.  Reception, Levitt Center for University Advancement

7:00-9:00 p.m.  Dinner, Levitt Center for University Advancement
    Remarks by President Sally Mason

Saturday, November 3

8:00-8:30 a.m.  Buffet Breakfast, North Room

8:30-10:00 a.m.  Where Should the Faculty Stand? Accountability in Higher Education
    Daniel Fogel, President, University of Vermont

10:00-10:15 a.m.  Break

10:15-11:45 a.m.  Is Affirmative Action History?
    Panelists:
    Marcella David, Office of the President, University of Iowa
    Susan Johnson, Office of the Provost, University of Iowa
    Diana Cates, Executive Board, University of Iowa Center for Human Rights
    Charles Smith, University of Michigan

11:45 a.m-12:00 p.m. Wrap-up – Suggest Topics for Next Year’s Conference
    Boxed lunches provided
We're glad you're interested in State U! The State University is a major public research and teaching institution that operates through a diverse, multicampus system. State U is bound together by a mission to serve as a "center for learning, research, scholarship and creative endeavor" in the district, the nation and the world. Opened in 1816, State University is a comprehensive educational and research institution with over 30,000 students and more than 2,100 faculty members. At State U, you'll find great academics, including 101 majors, honors programs, and award-winning faculty. You'll find great opportunities for undergraduate research, internships, study abroad, and more. All in a great location—in the heart of the nation's capital.

**Student Characteristics (Fall 2006)**

| Total Number of Students | 30,750 |

**Student Level and Enrollment Status**

- **Undergraduate**
  - Full-time: 2,890
  - Part-time: 19,860
- **Graduate/Professional**
  - Full-time: 3,660
  - Part-time: 4,400

**Undergraduate Success & Progress Rate**

- Graduated from State U: 85%
- Graduated at Another Institution: 83%
- Stilled Enrolled at State U: 79%
- Stilled Enrolled at Another Institution: 77%

**Undergraduate Profile**

- Total: 22,690

**Gender**

- Women: 11,400 (50%)
- Men: 11,200 (49%)

**Race/Ethnicity**

- African American / Black: 2,225 (10%)
- American Indian / Alaskan Native: 425 (2%)
- Asian / Pacific Islander: 1,330 (6%)
- Hispanic: 1,520 (7%)
- International: 1,640 (7%)
- White: 15,350 (68%)
- Race/Ethnicity Unknown: 200 (1%)

**Geographic Distribution (Degree-Seeking)**

- District of Columbia: 39%
- Other US States & Territories: 53%
- Other Countries: 8%

**Age (Degree-Seeking)**

- Average Age: 22
- Percent of Undergraduates Age 25 or Older: 10%

**College Portrait**

ONE OF THE STRENGTHS OF U.S. HIGHER EDUCATION IS THE BROAD RANGE OF DIVERSE INSTITUTIONS, EACH WITH ITS OWN DISTINCTIVE MISSION. COLLEGE STUDENTS HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SELECT THE INSTITUTION THAT IS THE BEST MATCH FOR THEIR INTERESTS, ABILITIES, AND GOALS. WE PRESENT THIS INFORMATION TO HELP STUDENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES BETTER UNDERSTAND HOW COLLEGES ARE ALIKE IN SOME WAYS, DIFFERENT IN OTHERS. THE ITEMS IN THE COLLEGE PORTRAIT WERE SELECTED BASED ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MANY FOCUS GROUPS AS WELL AS EXPERTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION. WHILE THESE ITEMS WILL GIVE YOU VALUABLE INSIGHT INTO COLLEGE LIFE, THEY WILL NOT CAPTURE THE FULL RANGE AND RICHNESS OF THE EXPERIENCE. WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO CHECK OUT COLLEGE WEB SITES AND VISIT CAMPUSES TO GET A MORE COMPLETE PICTURE OF THE OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO YOU.
Costs of Attendance and Financial Aid

Typical Undergraduate Costs per Year without Financial Aid (Full-Time, In-State Students)

- Room & Board (on campus), $5,800
- Other expenses (books, transportation, etc.), $2,500
- Tuition (in-state), $5,600
- Required Fees, $650

Total: $14,550

CLICK HERE for typical out-of-state costs and any discipline-specific tuition

The cost to attend State U varies based on the individual circumstances of students and may be reduced through grants and scholarships.

CLICK HERE To get a cost estimate for students like you!

Financial Aid Awarded to Undergraduates

Overall Financial Aid
- 70% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received financial aid of some type including need-based loans, work study, and non need-based scholarships.

Annual Need-Based Scholarships & Grants
- 30% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received need-based grants or scholarships; the average award for the year was $3,800.

Annual Need-Based Loans
- 40% of Fall 2005 full-time undergraduates received need-based work-study and/or loans (not including parent loans); the average loan for the year was $4,500.

Percent of Fall 2005 First-Time Students Receiving Each Type of Financial Aid

- State Grants: 15%
- Federal Grants: 20%
- Student Loans: 45%
- Institutional Aid/ Scholarships: 50%
- Any Type of Financial Aid: 82%

NOTE: Students may receive aid from more than one source.

Undergraduate Admissions

Test(s) Required for Admission: ACT or SAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle 50% of Test Score Range</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>580-690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>23-28</td>
<td>540-670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>540-670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50% of admitted students have test scores within the ranges listed, 25% have scores above, and 25% have scores below.

Percent in top 25% of High School Graduating Class: 77%
Percent in top 50% of High School Graduating Class: 97%
Average High School GPA (4-point scale): 3.54

Degrees and Areas of Study

Degrees Awarded at State U in 2005-06

- Bachelor's: 3,910
- Master's: 1,550
- Doctoral: 330
- Professional (e.g., Law, Medicine): 505
- Total: 6,295

Areas of Study with the Largest Number of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded in 2005-06

- Business/Management/Marketing: 15%
- Psychology: 13%
- Biological and Biomedical Sciences: 12%
- Engineering: 10%
- Communication/Journalism: 9%
- All other degree areas: 41%
- Total: 100%

CLICK HERE for a list of undergraduate and graduate programs
The Fighting Chicken Community

Student Success is not just our name, but our mission and our goal. With 25 departments and offices, over 1000 employees and an additional 1800 student employees, Student Success is a comprehensive student services organization at State University. We provide a variety of services and programs to assist students in the classroom, and out of the classroom. Because student success starts in the classroom, our offices and departments provide a variety of services and programs that enable students to excel academically. From new student orientation to registering for classes, academic advising and the writing center, programs are designed to assist you in making the most of your academic career. Student Success extends beyond the classroom, and many of our departments focus on providing you with opportunities to be active as a key member of the Fighting Chicken Community. Become involved in our residence halls, Greek organizations, student organizations and activities, and to take advantage of the many, many opportunities available to you here at State U.

Study at State U

Classroom Environment
Students per Faculty 18 to 1
Undergraduate classes with fewer than 30 students 75%
Undergraduate classes with fewer than 50 students 90%

Full-Time Instructional Faculty
Total Faculty 1,400
% Women 45%
% from Minority Groups 35%
% with Highest Degree in Field 95%

Carnegie Classification of Institutional Characteristics

Basic Type
Research Universities (high research activity)

Size and Setting
Large four-year, primarily residential

Enrollment Profile
High undergraduate

Undergraduate Profile
Full-time four-year, selective, higher transfer-in

Undergraduate Instructional Program
Balanced arts & sciences/professions, high graduate coexistence

Graduate Instructional Program
Comprehensive doctoral (no medical/veterinary)


Student Housing
60% of new freshmen live on campus
25% of all undergraduates live on campus

Campus Safety
The Security Monitor Program, a branch of the State University Police Department, offers free walking and biking security escorts to and from campus locations and nearby adjacent neighborhoods for all students, staff, faculty and visitors. All Security Monitors are given training in First Aid, CPR, and Body Substance Isolation are equipped with a First Aid Kit and a portable police radio in the event of an emergency.

Future Plans of 2005-06 Bachelor's Degree Recipients

CLICK HERE for Campus Crime Statistics Reports

NOTE: Report is updated annually.
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2006 College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.
CLICK HERE for information on the CSEQ survey.

Group Learning Experiences

1% of seniors participated in discussions with other students and faculty members outside of class
2% of seniors worked on class assignments and projects with other students
3% of seniors managed or provided leadership for a club or organization

Active Learning Experiences

4% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week outside of class on academic activities
5% of seniors worked with a faculty member on a research project
6% of seniors worked on an off-campus committee, organization, or project
7% of seniors applied material learned in class to other areas such as jobs or internships

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success

12% of seniors discussed career plans with a faculty member
13% of seniors discussed academic programs or course selections with a faculty member
14% of seniors used a learning lab or center to improve skills
15% of seniors talked with a faculty or staff member about personal concerns
16% of seniors reported working harder than they thought they could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations

Student Satisfaction

11% of seniors would attend the same university again if they started over

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas

8% of seniors had discussions with students from a different country than their own
9% of seniors had discussions with students whose philosophy of life and personal values were very different from their own
10% of seniors had discussions with students whose race or ethnic background was different than their own

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff

17% of seniors worked harder after receiving feedback from an instructor
18% of seniors discussed grades, make-up work, or assignments with their instructor
19% of seniors discussed ideas for term papers or other class projects with a faculty member
20% of seniors requested feedback from instructors about academic performance
21% of seniors found campus staff to be helpful, considerate, or flexible
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2005 College Senior Survey (CSS) from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.
CLICK HERE for information on the CSS survey.

**Group Learning Experiences**

1% of seniors have discussed course content with students outside of class
2% of seniors have studied with other students
3% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week in student clubs/groups

**Active Learning Experiences**

4% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and doing homework
5% of seniors reported challenging a professor's ideas in class
6% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to work on a research project
7% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to apply classroom learning to "real life" issues
8% of seniors performed community service as a part of a class
9% of seniors participated in a study abroad program
10% of seniors worked on an independent study program
11% of seniors participated in an internship program

**Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success**

20% of seniors were satisfied with tutoring or other academic assistance
22% of seniors were satisfied with academic advising
23% of seniors were satisfied with career counseling and advising

**Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas**

12% of seniors indicated they socialized with someone of another racial or ethnic group
13% of seniors indicated they often had meaningful and honest discussions about race or ethnic relations outside of class
14% of seniors stated that their knowledge of people from different races or cultures is stronger since entering college
15% of seniors stated that their ability to get along with people of different races or cultures is stronger since entering college

**Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff**

24% of seniors were satisfied with the amount of contact with faculty
25% of seniors reported they had an opportunity to discuss coursework outside of class
26% of seniors were satisfied with their ability to find a faculty of staff mentor

**Student Satisfaction**

16% of seniors were satisfied with the overall quality of instruction they received
17% of seniors stated they would choose to enroll at this college again
18% of seniors were satisfied with the overall sense of community among students
19% of seniors were satisfied with their overall college experience
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2006 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.
CLICK HERE for information on the NSSE survey.

Group Learning Experiences

1% of seniors worked with classmates on a group project
2% of seniors tutored or taught other students
3% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in co-curricular activities such as student organizations and intramural sports

Active Learning Experiences

4% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week preparing for class
5% of seniors worked on a research project with a faculty member
6% of seniors participated in an internship, practicum, or field experience
7% of seniors participated in community service or volunteer work
8% of seniors participated in study abroad
9% of seniors made at least one class presentation last year

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success

16% of seniors believe this institution provides support for student success
17% of seniors rated the quality of academic advising at this institution as good or excellent
18% of seniors reported that this institution provided help in coping with work, family and other non-academic responsibilities
19% of seniors reported working harder than they thought they could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations

Student Satisfaction

13% of seniors would attend this institution if they started over again
14% of seniors rated their entire educational experience as good or excellent
15% of seniors reported that other students were friendly or supportive

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff

20% of seniors believed that the campus staff were helpful, considerate, or flexible
21% of seniors believed that faculty are available, helpful, or sympathetic
22% of seniors reported that faculty members provided prompt feedback on their academic performance
23% of seniors discussed readings or ideas with faculty members outside of class

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas

10% of seniors reported that they often tried to understand someone else's point of view
11% of seniors reported their experience at this institution contributed to their understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds
12% of seniors often had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

CLICK HERE for examples of how State U evaluates the experiences of its students.

In addition, institutions participating in the VSA program measure student involvement on campus using one of four national surveys. Results from the one survey are reported for a common set of questions selected as part of VSA. Following are the selected results from the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of seniors who participated in the survey.

CLICK HERE for information on survey administration, the survey sample, and the response rate.

CLICK HERE for information on the UCUES survey.

Group Learning Experiences

1% of seniors worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates
2% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs
3% of seniors reported serving as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club
4% of seniors helped a classmate better understand course material

Active Learning Experiences

5% of seniors reported making class presentations
6% of seniors spent at least 6 hours per week studying and other academic activities outside of class
7% of seniors enrolled in at least one service learning course
8% of seniors participated in a study abroad program
9% of seniors participated in an internship
10% of seniors assisted faculty with research

Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success

19% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters
20% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with advising by college staff on academic matters
21% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the availability of courses needed for graduation
22% of seniors reported raising their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member

Student Satisfaction

15% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid
16% of seniors were at least somewhat satisfied with their overall academic experience
17% of seniors would choose to attend this institutional again
18% of seniors reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas

11% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate, or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good or better
12% of seniors rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good or better
13% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality
14% of seniors gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff

22% of seniors sought academic help from an instructor or tutor
23% of seniors talked with an instructor outside of class about course material
24% of seniors worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework
Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the 2007 results from the College Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP). The CAAP measures critical thinking and written communication using two test modules -- critical thinking and a writing essay.

CLICK HERE for a description of the CAAP test.
CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Average Institutional Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Essay</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAAP Score Range: 20 to 80

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

Critical Thinking
The increase in learning on the performance task is above what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.

Writing Essay
The increase in learning on the performance task is what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.

VSA participants report results from one of three learning outcomes instruments. Examples using all three are show for illustrative purposes.
Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the 2005-06 results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA). Such general skills are applicable and useful for both career and personal success and are important outcomes of college regardless of a student’s major. The CLA measures critical thinking, analytic reasoning and written communication using two different tasks -- a performance task and an analytic writing task.

CLICK HERE for a description of the CLA test.
CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Task</th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The increase in learning on the performance task is above what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic Writing Task</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The increase in learning on the performance task is what would be expected at an institution with students of similar academic abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Institutional Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Task</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CLA Score Range: 400 to 1600

VSA participants report results from one of three learning outcomes instruments. Examples using all three are show for illustrative purposes.
Student Learning Outcomes

All colleges and universities use multiple approaches to measure student learning. Many of these are specific to particular disciplines, many are coordinated with accrediting agencies, and many are based on outcomes after students have graduated. In addition, those institutions participating in the VSA measure increases in critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests.

Student Learning Assessment at State U

State University is a major research university that emphasizes student learning and effective teaching and sustains a culture that views research and teaching as equally critical to the overall learning environment. State U uses a variety of assessment tools to guide the development and enhancement of the undergraduate learning environment. In particular, the general education assessment process has become part of the campus culture. Not only has it provided important campus-wide data on the extent to which undergraduate students meet university-wide general education goals, it has served as the basis for broad conversations about the depth and breadth of general education knowledge that a State U graduate should possess. Other examples of student success measures used as part of campus improvement initiatives include: assessment in the undergraduate major, academic program review, licensure pass rates, graduation and retention rates, and professional accreditation.

CLICK HERE for examples of student learning assessment and outcomes at State U

Pilot Project to Measure Core Learning Outcomes

As a pilot project, VSA participants measure critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication using one of three tests. Following are the results from the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP). The MAPP measures critical thinking, analytic reasoning, and written communication and reports separate scores on critical thinking and written communication.

CLICK HERE for a description of the MAPP test.
CLICK HERE for information on test administration, the test sample, and the response rate.

Learning Gains Between Freshman Year and Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Thinking</th>
<th>Freshman Score</th>
<th>Senior Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MAPP Score Range: 100 to 130

VSA participants report results from one of three learning outcomes instruments. Examples using all three are show for illustrative purposes.