

Survey Participants	5
College Demographic Information	23
College Demographic Information	23
Summary of Main Findings	24
Chapter 1: Departmental Assessment	24
Developing an Assessment Plan	24
Assessment Plan	24
Assessment Office	24
Use of Software to Aid in Assessment	24
Chapter 2: Standardized Testing	25
Remedial Courses	25
Payout for Standardized Testing	26
Chapter 3: Assessment Office	26
Office	26
Full Time Assessment Employees	27
Assessment Office Salary Range	27
Assessment Office Size	27
Annual Assessment Office Budget	27
Assessment Professionals Working Outside of the Main Assessment Office	28
Size of the Basic Instructor Evaluation Form	28
Chapter 4: Student Assessment of Instructors	29
Questionnaires	29
Impact of Student Assessment Questionnaires on Tenure Decisions.	29
Impact of Student Faculty Assessment Questionnaires on the Hiring and Retention Regarding Adjunct Instructors.	30
Formats Used for the Completion of Student Assessment Questionnaires	30
Impact of Student Course Evaluations on Merit Pay Increases for Instructors	31
Chapter 5: Evaluation of adjunct faculty	32
Courses Taught by adjunct faculty	32
Methods of Evaluating adjunct faculty	32
Policy Towards Determining The Evaluation of adjunct faculty	33
The Evaluation of Adjunct Instructors	33
The Use of Student Evaluation Forms in Evaluating Adjunct Instructors	33
The Use of Standardized Tests in Evaluating Adjunct Instructors	34
The Use of In Class Visits by Full-Time Professors in Evaluating Adjunct Instructors	34
Evaluating Instructors	34
The Use of Student Evaluation Forms in Evaluating Instructors	34
The Use of Standardized Tests to Evaluate Learning in Chosen Majors in Evaluating Instructors	35
The Use of Standardized Tests Provided by Testing Companies to Obtain Results to Compare to National Data in Evaluating Instructors	35
The Use of In Class Visits by Full-Time Professors or Other Evaluators in Evaluating Instructors	35
Chapter 6: Faculty Involvement in Assessment	35
Role of College Faculty in Developing the College's Assessment Vehicles	35
Faculty Views on Assessment Efforts	36
Centers to Develop Faculty Teaching Skills	36
Approximate Annual Assessment Office Spending	36
Policy to Link Instructor Compensation to Documented Increases in Teaching Effectiveness	36
Chapter 7: Tutoring	37
Tutoring or Student Learning Center	37
Location of the Tutoring or Learning Center	37
Chapter 8: Assessing Student Services	37
Chapter 9: Assessment Environment	37
Chapter 10: Curriculum Changes	37

Chapter 11: Benchmarking Data	37
The Purchase of Student Performance Benchmarking Data	37
Colleges that use ZOOMERANG	38
Colleges that use WEAVEONLINE	38
Colleges that use SURVEYMONKEY	38
Colleges that use WEBSURVEYOR	38
Colleges that use STUDENTVOICE	38
Colleges that use KEY SURVEY	38
Colleges that use SURVEY TRACKER	38
Colleges that use SNAP	38
Colleges that use FLASHLIGHT ONLINE	38
Colleges that use ULTIMATE SURVEY	38
Chapter 12: Use of Consultants and Services	39
Spending on Outside Consultants and Services Related to Assessment	39
Conferences Devoted to Assessment that Administrators Attended in the Past Year	39
Chapter 13: Post Graduate Assessment	39
Colleges with a Post Graduate Assessment Program	39
Interviews of Students Who Graduate	39
Interviews of Students Who Transfer Out of College	39
Interviews of Students Who Drop Out of College	39
Number of Exit Interviews for Graduating Students	39
Exit Interviews Conducted With Students Who Left the College For Any Reason	40
Compensation for Students That Take Exit Interviews	40
Chapter 1: Departmental Assessment	41
Chapter 2: Standardized Testing	53
Chapter 3: Assessment Office	61
Chapter 4: Student Assessment of Instructors	69
Chapter 5: Evaluation of adjunct faculty	74
Chapter 6: Faculty Involvement in Assessment	83
Chapter 7: Tutoring	89
Chapter 8: Assessing Student Services	91
Chapter 9: Assessment Environment	92
Chapter 10: Curriculum Changes	93
Chapter 11: Benchmarking Data	95
Chapter 12: Use of Consultants and Services	104
Chapter 13: Post Graduation Assessment	107
Chapter 14: Assessing Assessment	114
Other Reports by Primary Research Group, Inc.	118
Table 1.1: Percentage of colleges in the sample that require that academic departments develop an assessment plan identifying key concepts and ideas that students should master	41
Table 1.2: Percentage of colleges in the sample that require that academic departments develop an assessment plan identifying key concepts and ideas that students should master, Broken Out by Type of College	41
Table 1.3: Percentage of colleges in the sample that require that academic departments develop an assessment plan identifying key concepts and ideas that students should master, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	41
Table 1.4: Percentage of colleges in the sample that require that academic departments develop an assessment plan identifying key concepts and ideas that students should master, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	41
Table 1.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum percentage of the major departments in the college that have developed a detailed assessment plan	42
Table 1.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Maximum percentage of the major departments in the college that have developed a detailed assessment plan, Broken Out by Type of College	42

Table 1.7:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Maximum percentage of the major departments in the college that have developed a detailed assessment plan, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	42
Table 1.8:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum percentage of the major departments in the college that have developed a detailed assessment plan, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	42
Table 1.9:	Percentage of college's Assessment Office (or other office entrusted with this task) that communicate with academic departments through designated assessment coordinators in the various academic departments	43
Table 1.10:	Percentage of college's Assessment Office (or other office entrusted with this task) that communicate with academic departments through designated assessment coordinators in the various academic departments, Broken Out by Type of College	43
Table 1.11:	Percentage of college's Assessment Office (or other office entrusted with this task) that communicate with academic departments through designated assessment coordinators in the various academic departments, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	43
Table 1.12:	Percentage of college's Assessment Office (or other office entrusted with this task) that communicate with academic departments through designated assessment coordinators in the various academic departments, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	43
Table 1.13:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package ACT	44
Table 1.14:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package ACT, Broken Out by Type of College	44
Table 1.15:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package ACT, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	44
Table 1.16:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package ACT, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	44
Table 1.17:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package Accuplacer	44
Table 1.18:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package Accuplacer, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	45
Table 1.19:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package Accuplacer, Broken Out by Type of College	45
Table 1.20:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package Accuplacer, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	45
Table 1.21:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package COMPASS	45
Table 1.22:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package COMPASS, Broken Out by Type of College	45
Table 1.23:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package COMPASS, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	46
Table 1.24:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that use the Assessment Package COMPASS, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	46
Table 1.25:	Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Mathematics Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen	46
Table 1.26:	Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Mathematics Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Type of College	46
Table 1.27:	Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Mathematics Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	46
Table 1.28:	Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Mathematics Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	47

Table 1.29: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Reading Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen	47
Table 1.30: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Reading Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Type of College	47
Table 1.31: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Reading Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	47
Table 1.32: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Reading Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	47
Table 1.33: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Writing Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen	48
Table 1.34: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Writing Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Type of College	48
Table 1.35: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Writing Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	48
Table 1.36: Percentage of Colleges that Administer the Writing Section of COMPASS to incoming Freshmen, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	48
Table 1.37: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the NSSE	48
Table 1.38: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the NSSE, Broken Out by Type of College	49
Table 1.39: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the NSSE, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	49
Table 1.40: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the NSSE, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	49
Table 1.41: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the HERI	49
Table 1.42: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the HERI, Broken Out by Type of College	49
Table 1.43: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the HERI, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	50
Table 1.44: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the HERI, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	50
Table 1.45: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc.	50
Table 1.46: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc., Broken Out by Type of College	50
Table 1.47: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc., Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	50
Table 1.48: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used data from Educational Benchmarking, Inc., Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	51
Table 1.49: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the Center for Education Assessment	51
Table 1.50: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the Center for Education Assessment, Broken Out by Type of College	51
Table 1.51: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the Center for Education Assessment, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	51
Table 1.52: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used the Center for Education Assessment, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	51
Table 1.53: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used Chalk & Wire EPortfolio	52
Table 1.54: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used Chalk & Wire Eportfolio, Broken Out by Type of College	52
Table 1.55: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used Chalk & Wire Eportfolio, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	52
Table 1.56: Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that have ever used Chalk & Wire Eportfolio, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	52

Table 2.1:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in WRITING for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum	53
Table 2.2:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in WRITING for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Type of College	53
Table 2.3:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in WRITING for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	53
Table 2.4:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in WRITING for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	53
Table 2.5:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in STUDY SKILLS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum	54
Table 2.6:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in STUDY SKILLS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Type of College	54
Table 2.7:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in STUDY SKILLS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	54
Table 2.8:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in STUDY SKILLS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	54
Table 2.9:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum	55
Table 2.10:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Type of College	55
Table 2.11:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	55
Table 2.12:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	55
Table 2.13:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in MATHEMATICS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum	56
Table 2.14:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in MATHEMATICS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Type of College	56
Table 2.15:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in MATHEMATICS for students who do not perform well enough on	

	standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	56
Table 2.16:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in MATHEMATICS for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	56
Table 2.17:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in INFORMATION/COMPUTER LITERACY for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum	57
Table 2.18:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in INFORMATION/COMPUTER LITERACY for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Type of College	57
Table 2.19:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in INFORMATION/COMPUTER LITERACY for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	57
Table 2.20:	Percentage of Colleges in the Sample that offer remedial or developmental courses in INFORMATION/COMPUTER LITERACY for students who do not perform well enough on standardized tests to take the normal college curriculum, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	57
Table 2.21:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum that colleges in the sample spent to pay students to take standardized tests that are primarily used within the college to aid it in its assessment efforts in \$ U.S.	58
Table 2.22:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum That colleges in the sample spent to pay students to take standardized tests that are primarily used within the college to aid it in its assessment efforts in \$ U.S., Broken Out by Type of College	58
Table 2.23:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum That colleges in the sample spent to pay students to take standardized tests that are primarily used within the college to aid it in its assessment efforts in \$ U.S., Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	58
Table 2.24:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum That colleges in the sample spent to pay students to take standardized tests that are primarily used within the college to aid it in its assessment efforts in \$ U.S., Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	58
Table 2.25:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer a higher rate of pay or reward to students that score higher on standardized assessment tests, on the theory that this encourages full student effort	59
Table 2.26:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer a higher rate of pay or reward to students that score higher on standardized assessment tests, on the theory that this encourages full student effort, Broken Out by Type of College	59
Table 2.27:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer a higher rate of pay or reward to students that score higher on standardized assessment tests, on the theory that this encourages full student effort, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	59
Table 2.28:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer a higher rate of pay or reward to students that score higher on standardized assessment tests, on the theory that this encourages full student effort, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	60
Table 3.2:	Percentage of colleges that have an office of assessment or similar office or department that primarily devotes itself to assessment	61
Table 3.3:	Percentage of colleges that have an office of assessment or similar office or department that primarily devotes itself to assessment, Broken Out by Type of College	61

Table 3.4:	Percentage of colleges that have an office of assessment or similar office or department that primarily devotes itself to assessment, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	61
Table 3.5:	Percentage of colleges that have an office of assessment or similar office or department that primarily devotes itself to assessment, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	62
Table 3.6:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of Full Time Employees in the sample college's office of assessment, or similar office that is primarily devoted to this function	62
Table 3.7:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of Full Time Employees in the sample college's office of assessment, or similar office that is primarily devoted to this function, Broken Out by Type of College	62
Table 3.8:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of Full Time Employees in the sample college's office of assessment, or similar office that is primarily devoted to this function, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	62
Table 3.9:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of Full Time Employees in the sample college's office of assessment, or similar office that is primarily devoted to this function, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	63
Table 3.10:	Sample college's annual salary range for the highest ranking assessment officer	63
Table 3.11:	Sample college's annual salary range for the highest ranking assessment officer, Broken Out by Type of College	63
Table 3.12:	Sample college's annual salary range for the highest ranking assessment officer, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	63
Table 3.13:	Sample college's annual salary range for the highest ranking assessment officer, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	64
Table 3.14:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of size of college assessment office for colleges in the sample, in square feet	64
Table 3.15:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of size of college assessment office for colleges in the sample, in square feet, Broken Out by Type of College	64
Table 3.16:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of size of college assessment office for colleges in the sample, in square feet, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	64
Table 3.17:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Of size of college assessment office for colleges in the sample, in square feet, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	65
Table 3.18:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of annual budget, for colleges in the sample, of the assessment office, including salaries and overhead	65
Table 3.19:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of annual budget, for colleges in the sample, of the assessment office, including salaries and overhead, Broken Out by Type of College	65
Table 3.20:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of annual budget, for colleges in the sample, of the assessment office, including salaries and overhead., Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	65
Table 3.21:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum of annual budget, for colleges in the sample, of the assessment office, including salaries and overhead, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	66
Table 3.22:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of assessment professionals working in other offices outside of the main college assessment office	66
Table 3.23:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of assessment professionals working in other offices outside of the main college assessment office, Broken Out by Type of College	66
Table 3.24:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of assessment professionals working in other offices outside of the main college assessment office, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	66

Table 3.25: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of assessment professionals working in other offices outside of the main college assessment office, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	67
Table 3.26: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of questions that the basic instructor evaluation form that is handed to students has	67
Table 3.27: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of questions that the basic instructor evaluation form that is handed to students has, Broken Out by Type of College	67
Table 3.28: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of questions that the basic instructor evaluation form that is handed to students has, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	67
Table 3.29: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of questions that the basic instructor evaluation form that is handed to students has, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	68
Table 4.1: Description of college's policies towards questionnaires for student assessment of instructors	69
Table 4.2: Description of college's policies towards questionnaires for student assessment of instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	69
Table 4.3: Description of college's policies towards questionnaires for student assessment of instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	69
Table 4.4: Description of college's policies towards questionnaires for student assessment of instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	69
Table 4.5: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on tenure decisions	70
Table 4.6: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on tenure decisions, Broken Out by Type of College	70
Table 4.7: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on tenure decisions, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	70
Table 4.8: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on tenure decisions, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	70
Table 4.9: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on the hiring and retention decisions regarding ADJUNCT instructors	71
Table 4.10: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on the hiring and retention decisions regarding ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	71
Table 4.11: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on the hiring and retention decisions regarding ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	71
Table 4.12: Description of the impact of student faculty assessment questionnaires on the hiring and retention decisions regarding ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	71
Table 4.13: Description of formats used for the completion of student assessment questionnaires	72
Table 4.14: Description of formats used for the completion of student assessment questionnaires, Broken Out by Type of College	72
Table 4.15: Description of formats used for the completion of student assessment questionnaires, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	72
Table 4.16: Description of formats used for the completion of student assessment questionnaires, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	72
Table 4.17: Description of the impact of student course evaluations on merit pay increases for instructors	73
Table 4.18: Description of the impact of student course evaluations on merit pay increases for instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	73
Table 4.19: Description of the impact of student course evaluations on merit pay increases for instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	73

Table 4.20:	Description of the impact of student course evaluations on merit pay increases for instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	73
Table 5.1:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of the percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty	74
Table 5.2:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum, for colleges in the sample, of the percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Type of College	74
Table 5.3:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of the percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	74
Table 5.4:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum , for colleges in the sample, of the percentage of courses taught by adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	74
Table 5.5:	Description of the method for evaluating adjunct faculty	75
Table 5.6:	Description of the method for evaluating adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Type of College	75
Table 5.7:	Description of the method for evaluating adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	75
Table 5.8:	Description of the method for evaluating adjunct faculty, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	75
Table 5.9:	Description of college's policy towards determining the evaluation of ADJUNCT instructors	76
Table 5.10:	Description of college's policy towards determining the evaluation of ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	76
Table 5.11:	Description of college's policy towards determining the evaluation of ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	76
Table 5.12:	Description of college's policy towards determining the evaluation of ADJUNCT instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	77
Table 5.13:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate adjunct instructors	77
Table 5.14:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	77
Table 5.15:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	77
Table 5.16:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	78
Table 5.17:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use standardized tests to evaluate adjunct instructors	78
Table 5.18:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use standardized tests to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	78
Table 5.19:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use standardized tests to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	78
Table 5.20:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use standardized tests to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	78
Table 5.21:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use in class visits by full-time professors to evaluate adjunct instructors	79
Table 5.22:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use in class visits by full-time professors to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	79
Table 5.23:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use in class visits by full-time professors to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	79
Table 5.24:	Percentage of colleges that commonly use in class visits by full-time professors to evaluate adjunct instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	79

Table 5.25: Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate instructors	79
Table 5.26: Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	80
Table 5.27: Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	80
Table 5.28: Percentage of colleges that commonly use student evaluation forms to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	80
Table 5.29: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests to Evaluate Learning in Chosen Majors, to evaluate instructors	80
Table 5.30: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests to Evaluate Learning in Chosen Majors, to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	80
Table 5.31: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests to Evaluate Learning in Chosen Majors, to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	81
Table 5.32: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests to Evaluate Learning in Chosen Majors, to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	81
Table 5.33: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests Provided by Testing Companies to Obtain Results to Compare to National Data to evaluate instructors	81
Table 5.34: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests Provided by Testing Companies to Obtain Results to Compare to National Data to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	81
Table 5.35: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests Provided by Testing Companies to Obtain Results to Compare to National Data to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	81
Table 5.36: Percentage of colleges that commonly use Standardized Tests Provided by Testing Companies to Obtain Results to Compare to National Data to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	82
Table 5.37: Percentage of colleges that commonly use In Class Visits by Full time professors or instructors or other evaluators to evaluate instructors	82
Table 5.38: Percentage of colleges that commonly use In Class Visits by Full time professors or instructors or other evaluators to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Type of College	82
Table 5.39: Percentage of colleges that commonly use In Class Visits by Full time professors or instructors or other evaluators to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	82
Table 5.40: Percentage of colleges that commonly use In Class Visits by Full time professors or instructors or other evaluators to evaluate instructors, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	82
Table 6.1: Description of college faculty's role in developing the college's assessment vehicles	83
Table 6.2: Description of college faculty's role in developing the college's assessment vehicles, Broken Out by Type of College	83
Table 6.3: Description of college faculty's role in developing the college's assessment vehicles, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	83
Table 6.4: Description of college faculty's role in developing the college's assessment vehicles, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	84
Table 6.5: Description of college's faculty views on the assessment efforts of the college administration	84
Table 6.6: Description of college's faculty views on the assessment efforts of the college administration, Broken Out by Type of College	84
Table 6.7: Description of college's faculty views on the assessment efforts of the college administration, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	85

Table 6.8:	Description of college's faculty views on the assessment efforts of the college administration, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	85
Table 6.9:	Percentage of colleges in the sample that have one or more centers to develop faculty teaching skills	85
Table 6.10:	Percentage of colleges in the sample that have one or more centers to develop faculty teaching skills, Broken Out by Type of College	85
Table 6.11:	Percentage of colleges in the sample that have one or more centers to develop faculty teaching skills, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	86
Table 6.12:	Percentage of colleges in the sample that have one or more centers to develop faculty teaching skills, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	86
Table 6.13:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Approximate annual spending for staff, office space, software, and other costs for colleges in the sample that have such centers	86
Table 6.14:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Annual spending for staff, office space, software, and other costs for colleges in the sample that have such centers, Broken Out by Type of College	86
Table 6.15:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Annual spending for staff, office space, software, and other costs for colleges in the sample that have such centers, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	87
Table 6.16:	Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Annual spending for staff, office space, software, and other costs for colleges in the sample that have such centers, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	87
Table 6.17:	Percentages of colleges in the sample that say they have a clear policy to link instructor compensation to documented increases in teaching effectiveness	87
Table 6.18:	Percentages of colleges in the sample that say they have a clear policy to link instructor compensation to documented increases in teaching effectiveness, Broken Out by Type of College	87
Table 6.19:	Percentages of colleges in the sample that say they have a clear policy to link instructor compensation to documented increases in teaching effectiveness, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	88
Table 6.20:	Percentages of colleges in the sample that say they have a clear policy to link instructor compensation to documented increases in teaching effectiveness, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	88
Table 7.1:	Percentage of colleges that have a tutoring or student learning center	89
Table 7.2:	Percentage of colleges that have a tutoring or student learning center, Broken Out by Type of College	89
Table 7.3:	Percentage of colleges that have a tutoring or student learning center, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	89
Table 7.4:	Percentage of colleges that have a tutoring or student learning center, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	89
Table 7.5:	Description of the location of the tutoring or learning center for colleges that have one	89
Table 7.6:	Description of the location of the tutoring or learning center for colleges that have one, Broken Out by Type of College	90
Table 7.7:	Description of the location of the tutoring or learning center for colleges that have one, Broken Out by Public or Private institutional status	90
Table 7.8:	Description of the location of the tutoring or learning center for colleges that have one, Broken Out by Full time Equivalent Enrollment	90
Table 8.1:	Percentage of colleges whose administration conduct student surveys of the satisfaction that students have with college student services such as the food service, dormitory services, bookstore, library, etc.	91
Table 8.2:	Percentage of colleges whose administration conduct student surveys of the satisfaction that students have with college student services such as the food service, dormitory services, bookstore, library, etc. , Broken Out by Type of College	91

Table 8.3:	Percentage of colleges whose administration conduct student surveys of the satisfaction that students have with college student services such as the food service, dormitory services, bookstore, library, etc. , Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	91
Table 8.4:	Percentage of colleges whose administration conduct student surveys of the satisfaction that students have with college student services such as the food service, dormitory services, bookstore, library, etc. , Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	91
Table 9.1:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer an annual “Assessment Day” or “assessment workshop” or “Assessment Seminar” or its equivalent for faculty and staff	92
Table 9.2:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer an annual “Assessment Day” or “assessment workshop” or “Assessment Seminar” or its equivalent for faculty and staff. , Broken Out by Type of College	92
Table 9.3:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer an annual “Assessment Day” or “assessment workshop” or “Assessment Seminar” or its equivalent for faculty and staff. , Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	92
Table 9.4:	Percentage of colleges sampled that offer an annual “Assessment Day” or “assessment workshop” or “Assessment Seminar” or its equivalent for faculty and staff. , Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	92
Table 10.1:	Description of the success of assessment efforts for colleges sampled	93
Table 10.2:	Description of the success of assessment efforts for colleges sampled, Broken Out by Type of College	93
Table 10.3:	Description of the success of assessment efforts for colleges sampled, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	93
Table 10.4:	Description of the success of assessment efforts for colleges sampled, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	94
Table 11.1:	Percentage of colleges sampled that have ever purchased student performance benchmarking data to compare their students’ performance to that of national norms	95
Table 11.2:	Percentage of colleges sampled that have ever purchased student performance benchmarking data to compare their students’ performance to that of national norms, Broken Out by Type of College	95
Table 11.3:	Percentage of colleges sampled that have ever purchased student performance benchmarking data to compare their students’ performance to that of national norms, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	95
Table 11.4:	Percentage of colleges sampled that have ever purchased student performance benchmarking data to compare their students’ performance to that of national norms, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	95
Table 11.5:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use ZOOMERANG for assessment purposes	95
Table 11.6:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use ZOOMERANG for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	96
Table 11.7:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use ZOOMERANG for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	96
Table 11.8:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use ZOOMERANG for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	96
Table 11.9:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEAVEONLINE for assessment purposes	96
Table 11.10:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEAVEONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	96
Table 11.11:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEAVEONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	97
Table 11.12:	Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEAVEONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	97

Table 11.13: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEYMONKEY for assessment purposes	97
Table 11.14: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEYMONKEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	97
Table 11.15: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEYMONKEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	97
Table 11.16: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEYMONKEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	98
Table 11.17: Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEBSURVEYOR for assessment purposes	98
Table 11.18: Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEBSURVEYOR for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	98
Table 11.19: Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEBSURVEYOR for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	98
Table 11.20: Percentage of colleges sampled that use WEBSURVEYOR for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	98
Table 11.21: Percentage of colleges sampled that use STUDENTVOICE for assessment purposes	99
Table 11.22: Percentage of colleges sampled that use STUDENTVOICE for assessment purposeS, Broken Out by Type of College	99
Table 11.23: Percentage of colleges sampled that use STUDENTVOICE for assessment purposeS, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	99
Table 11.24: Percentage of colleges sampled that use STUDENTVOICE for assessment purposeS, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	99
Table 11.25: Percentage of colleges sampled that use KEY SURVEY for assessment purposes	99
Table 11.26: Percentage of colleges sampled that use KEY SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	100
Table 11.27: Percentage of colleges sampled that use KEY SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	100
Table 11.28: Percentage of colleges sampled that use KEY SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	100
Table 11.29: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEY TRACKER PLUS for assessment purposes	100
Table 11.30: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEY TRACKER PLUS for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	100
Table 11.31: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEY TRACKER PLUS for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	101
Table 11.32: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SURVEY TRACKER PLUS for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	101
Table 11.33: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SNAP for assessment purposes	101
Table 11.34: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SNAP for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	101
Table 11.35: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SNAP for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	101
Table 11.36: Percentage of colleges sampled that use SNAP for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	102
Table 11.37: Percentage of colleges sampled that use FLASHLIGHT ONLINE for assessment purposes	102
Table 11.38: Percentage of colleges sampled that use FLASHLIGHT ONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	102
Table 11.39: Percentage of colleges sampled that use FLASHLIGHT ONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	102
Table 11.40: Percentage of colleges sampled that use FLASHLIGHT ONLINE for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	102

Table 11.41: Percentage of colleges sampled that use ULTIMATE SURVEY for assessment purposes	103
Table 11.42: Percentage of colleges sampled that use ULTIMATE SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Type of College	103
Table 11.43: Percentage of colleges sampled that use ULTIMATE SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	103
Table 11.44: Percentage of colleges sampled that use ULTIMATE SURVEY for assessment purposes, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	103
Table 12.1: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum spending by college administration on outside consultants, reports, conferences and other consulting services related to assessment within the past Year	104
Table 12.2: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum spending by college administration on outside consultants, reports, conferences and other consulting services related to assessment within the past Year., Broken Out by Type of College	104
Table 12.3: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum spending by college administration on outside consultants, reports, conferences and other consulting services related to assessment within the past Year, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	104
Table 12.4: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum spending by college administration on outside consultants, reports, conferences and other consulting services related to assessment within the past Year, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	105
Table 12.5: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Approximate number of conferences devoted to Assessment issues that ADMNINSTRATORS from colleges surveyed attended in the past year	105
Table 12.6: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Approximate number of conferences devoted to Assessment issues that ADMNINSTRATORS from colleges surveyed attended in the past year, Broken Out by Type of College	105
Table 12.7: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Approximate number of conferences devoted to Assessment issues that ADMNINSTRATORS from colleges surveyed attended in the past year, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	105
Table 12.8: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum Approximate number of conferences devoted to Assessment issues that ADMNINSTRATORS from colleges surveyed attended in the past year, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	106
Table 13.1: Percentage of colleges surveyed that have a post graduate assessment program	107
Table 13.2: Percentage of colleges surveyed that have a post graduate assessment program, Broken Out by Type of College	107
Table 13.3: Percentage of colleges surveyed that have a post graduate assessment program, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	107
Table 13.4: Percentage of colleges surveyed that have a post graduate assessment program, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	107
Table 13.5: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO GRADUATE at least once per year	107
Table 13.6: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO GRADUATE at least once per year, Broken Out by Type of College	108
Table 13.7: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO GRADUATE at least once per year, Broken Out By Public or Private Institutional Status	108
Table 13.8: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO GRADUATE at least once per year, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	108

Table 13.9: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO TRANSFER OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year	108
Table 13.10: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO TRANSFER OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year, Broken Out by Type of College	109
Table 13.11: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO TRANSFER OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	109
Table 13.12: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO TRANSFER OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	109
Table 13.13: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO DROP OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year	109
Table 13.14: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO DROP OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year, Broken Out by Type of College	110
Table 13.15: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO DROP OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year , Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	110
Table 13.16: Percentage of colleges surveyed that conducts INTERVIEWS OF STUDENTS WHO DROP OUT OF COLLEGE at least once per year, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	110
Table 13.17: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with graduating students for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews	110
Table 13.18: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with graduating students for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews, Broken Out by Type of College	111
Table 13.19: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with graduating students for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	111
Table 13.20: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with graduating students for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	111
Table 13.21: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with students who left the college for any reason in the past year for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews	111
Table 13.22: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with students who left the college for any reason in the past year for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	112
Table 13.23: Mean, Median, Minimum and Maximum approximate number of exit interviews conducted with students who left the college for any reason in the past year for colleges in the sample that conducted such interviews, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	112
Table 13.24: Percentage of colleges that offer compensation of any kind for students that take exit interviews	112
Table 13.25: Percentage of colleges that offer compensation of any kind for students that take exit interviews, Broken Out by Type of College	112
Table 13.26: Percentage of colleges that offer compensation of any kind for students that take exit interviews, Broken Out by Public or Private Institutional Status	112
Table 13.27: Percentage of colleges that offer compensation of any kind for students that take exit interviews, Broken Out by Full time equivalent enrollment	113