

2005-2007

INSTITUTIONAL REPORT

Grand Valley State University

**collegiate
learning
assessment**

council for aid to education

215 lexington avenue floor 21 new york new york 10016-6023
p | 212.217.0700 f | 212.661.9766 e | cla@cae.org w | www.cae.org/cla

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the Lumina Foundation for Education for funding the four-year CLA longitudinal study.

Note to Reader

This revised report differs from the report that your campus received in September, 2007 in two ways:

1. Scatter Plot and Value Added Index:

In Figure 2 (on page 8) you will see that the x-axis reflects the freshman fall 2005 (Time 1) CLA scores. As you know, in your fall 2005 – spring 2006 Institutional Report, the x-axis represented SAT scores. The first version of this 2005 – 2007 Interim Longitudinal Report used a composite score of both freshman fall 2005 CLA total scores and SAT scores; this revised version controls for freshman CLA scores only. As such, your value-added index scores and performance levels (which appear in the Summary Results Table on page 2 and Table 4 on page 9) report how your rising juniors performed relative to what was expected given their mean CLA scores in fall 2005. The index scores correspond to standard errors and reflect how far above or below the regression line your school's dot appears. By contrast, the effect size (which appears in the Summary Results Table on page 2 and Table 5 on page 9) reports the difference between fall 2005 and spring 2007 mean scale scores divided by the standard deviation of scores in fall 2005.

2. Analytic Writing Task Scores:

For a variety of reasons, approximately 8 to 10 percent of Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument responses were unscorable by e-rater®, which is no longer used by CAE. (You will recall that the performance tasks are scored by CAE's human scorers.) Due to the concerns many institutions expressed regarding sample size, we had all Make-an-Argument and Break-an-Argument responses that were marked unscorable by e-rater® in both fall 2005 and spring 2007 re-reviewed and re-scored by human scorers. While roughly 7 percent of these hand-graded results remained unscorable (e.g., off topic, too brief, restatement of prompt, etc.), the remainder received valid, albeit relatively low, scores. The results for most institutions did not change significantly. However, it was important that we add as many students as possible to your sample and make changes where appropriate. This Institutional Report and your Student Data File will contain revised numbers of students recorded as completing the Analytic Writing Task (Make-an-Argument and Break-an-Argument). You will also see revised mean scores for Analytic Writing Task, Make-an-Argument, Critique-an-Argument, and Total (see Table 4 on page 9) which ripple into calculations of (and thus may have a slight impact on) other statistics such as the value-added index and effect size.

The third phase of testing for the Lumina Longitudinal cohort will take place in spring 2009. To enhance your sample, we encourage you to secure the participation of students who tested as freshmen but did not test as rising juniors in the final graduating senior test administration. We have adjusted our analysis plan to assess separately the cohorts that tested twice versus those that tested at all three time points.

We appreciate your continued commitment to the CLA Lumina Longitudinal Study.

Contents

This report presents Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) results for colleges and universities that tested the same students in the fall of 2005 as freshmen and in the spring of 2007 as second semester sophomores (“rising juniors”). Six sections follow this contents page:

- I Institutional Executive Summary (page 2)
Summary results for your school

- II Longitudinal Cohort Summary (page 3)
Summary observations on change in mean scores across institutions

- III CLA Tasks and Scores (pages 4-5)
Description of CLA tasks and scores

- IV Characteristics of Participating Institutions and Students (pages 6-7)
Descriptions of school and student samples by Carnegie Classification, key school characteristics and SAT scores

- V Institutional Tables and Figures (pages 7-13)
Comprehensive and technical version of results at your school and all schools

- VI Technical Appendices (pages 14-18)
Conversion tables, documentation of modeling procedures, list of institutions, and description of CLA Student Data File
 - A *Standard ACT to SAT Conversion Table (page 14)*
 - B *Procedures for Converting Raw Scores to Scale Scores (page 15)*
 - C *Equations Used to Estimate Spring 2007 CLA Scores on the Basis Fall 2005 CLA Scores (page 16)*
 - D *List of CLA Longitudinal Schools (page 17)*
 - E *CLA Student Data File (page 18)*

I. Institutional Executive Summary

The CLA measures how your students perform on tasks that require an integrated set of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication skills. The CLA findings¹ reported here focus on student growth over time on the higher order skills measured. This communicates to schools how much growth occurred within the samples of students they tested and whether this growth was comparable to that at other institutions participating in the longitudinal study.² This report provides revised interim results for the sample of your students that tested in the fall of 2005 and again in the spring of 2007. A final report will be issued after these students are tested again as seniors in the spring of 2009. This report addresses three primary questions:

1. How did my students, as a group, perform in the spring of 2007 after taking into account their performance as freshmen in the fall of 2005?

Given their fall 2005 CLA score (1133) we would expect your sample of 133 students to score 1155 on the CLA in spring 2007. Their actual score of 1155 is At Expected (on the regression line).

2. How much change occurred between fall 2005 and spring 2007?

As a group your students scored 23 points higher in the spring of 2007 than in the fall of 2005. Expressed in standard deviation units as an effect size of 0.16, this result is about the same relative to other participating institutions.

3. Is this change consistent across students?

The correlation between how your students scored in the fall of 2005 and the spring of 2007 was 0.49, which is about the same relative to other participating institutions.

Summary Results Table: Grand Valley State University

	133	Number of Students Tested (<i>in both fall 2005 and spring 2007</i>)
	1113	Mean SAT Score
	1133	Freshman Mean CLA Scale Score
	1155	<i>Expected</i> Rising Junior Mean CLA Scale Score
	1155	Rising Junior Mean CLA Scale Score
At	0.00	Value Added Index
	23	Mean Difference between Rising Junior and Freshman Scale Scores
Middle	0.16	Effect Size
Middle	0.49	Correlation of Freshman and Rising Junior Mean Scores

¹ A CLA Student Data File accompanies this report for your institution to make linkages among student-level CLA results and locally-collected data (e.g., student engagement outcomes, enrollment and course-taking patterns, grades, etc.).


² Thirty-two institutions initiated longitudinal studies with freshmen in fall 2005 and tested a sufficient number of the same students in the spring of 2007.

II. Longitudinal Cohort Summary

Not every institution participating in the CLA longitudinal study demonstrated growth in mean CLA scores of the same students tested in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. In fact, at some schools the change was negative.

The “box and whisker” plots in Figure 1 (bottom) depict the distribution of effect sizes on each CLA measure across institutions participating in the longitudinal study. An effect size is one way to measure change between two time points. For the purposes of this report, effect sizes were calculated at a school by taking the difference in mean (or average) scores of the same students when they took the CLA in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. This difference is then divided by the spread of scores (in this case, the standard deviation of student scores in the fall of 2005 for those students who also tested successfully in the spring of 2007) to place it in context.


In each plot, the extreme left hand vertical bar shows the 5th percentile, the vertical lines in the “box” itself show the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentile points, and the extreme right hand vertical line shows the 95th percentile.



The horizontal x-axis shows the effect size. For example, on the Performance Task, about 5 percent of the schools had an effect size that was less than -0.35, about 50 percent of the schools had an effect size that was between 0.05 and 0.35, and about 5 percent of the schools had an effect size that was greater than 0.55. An inspection of these plots shows that there was a greater spread of effect sizes across schools for Total CLA scores than there was for Performance Task scores.

In the months to come, the CLA research team will work with some CLA longitudinal schools (through forums, focus groups, campus visits, and case studies) to investigate the extent to which differences in other variables explain the observed performance differences on the CLA. These might include systematic differences across campuses in student motivation, incentives, academic programs (e.g., general education), “growth curves” over four years, performance expectations, and “cultures of evidence,” etc.

Figure 1
Mean Score Changes between Fall 2005 and Spring 2007 by CLA Task Type
Effect Size Box and Whisker Plots



III. CLA Tasks and Scores

The CLA uses various types of tasks, all of which require students to construct written responses to open-ended questions. There are no multiple-choice questions on the assessment.

Performance Tasks

Each Performance Task requires students to use an integrated set of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication skills to answer several open-ended questions about a hypothetical but realistic situation. In addition to directions and questions, each Performance Task also has its own document library that includes a range of information sources, such as letters, memos, summaries of research reports, newspaper articles, maps, photographs, diagrams, tables, charts, and interview notes or transcripts. Students are instructed to use these materials in preparing their answers to the Performance Task's questions within the allotted 90 minutes.

The first portion of each Performance Task contains general instructions and introductory material. The student is then presented with a split screen. On the right side of the screen is a list of the materials in the document library. The student selects a particular document to view by using a pull-down menu. On the left side of the screen are a question and a response box. There is no limit on how much a student can type. When a student completes a question, he or she then selects the next question in the queue. Some of these components are illustrated below:

Introductory Material: You advise Pat Williams, the president of DynaTech, a company that makes precision electronic instruments and navigational equipment. Sally Evans, a member of DynaTech's sales force, recommended that DynaTech buy a small private plane (a SwiftAir 235) that she and other members of the sales force could use to visit customers. Pat was about to approve the purchase when there was an accident involving a SwiftAir 235. Your document library contains the following materials:

1. Newspaper article about the accident
2. Federal Accident Report on in-flight breakups in single-engine planes
3. Internal Correspondence (Pat's e-mail to you & Sally's e-mail to Pat)
4. Charts relating to SwiftAir's performance characteristics
5. Excerpt from magazine article comparing SwiftAir 235 to similar planes
6. Pictures and descriptions of SwiftAir Models 180 and 235

Sample Questions: Do the available data tend to support or refute the claim that the type of wing on the SwiftAir 235 leads to more in-flight breakups? What is the basis for your conclusion? What other factors might have contributed to the accident and should be taken into account? What is your preliminary recommendation about whether or not DynaTech should buy the plane and what is the basis for this recommendation?

No two Performance Tasks assess the same combination of abilities. The contexts for the tasks also vary. Some are set in a science context whereas others are set in a business, social science or humanities context. Some tasks ask students to identify and then compare and contrast the strengths and limitations of alternative hypotheses for explaining or dealing with a given problem or different points of view, courses of action, etc. To perform these and other tasks, students have to weigh different types of evidence, evaluate the credibility of various documents, spot possible bias, and identify questionable or critical assumptions.

Performance Tasks also may ask students to suggest or select a course of action to resolve conflicting or competing strategies and then provide a rationale for that decision, including why it is likely to be better than one or more other approaches. For example, students may be asked to anticipate potential difficulties or hazards that are associated with different ways of dealing with a problem including the likely short- and long-term consequences and implications of these strategies. Students may then be asked to suggest and defend one or more of these approaches. Alternatively, students may be asked to review a collection of materials or a set of options, analyze and organize them on multiple dimensions, and then defend that organization.

Performance Tasks often require students to marshal evidence from different sources; distinguish rational from emotional arguments and fact from opinion; understand data in tables and figures; deal with inadequate, ambiguous, and/or conflicting information; spot deception and holes in the arguments made by others; recognize information that is and is not relevant to the task at hand; identify additional information that would help to resolve issues; and weigh, organize, and synthesize information from several sources.

All of the Performance Tasks require students to present their ideas clearly, including justifying their points of view. For example, they might note the specific ideas or sections in the document library that support their position and describe the flaws or shortcomings in the arguments' underlying alternative approaches.

Analytic Writing Tasks

Students write answers to two types of essay prompts, namely: a "Make-an-Argument" question that asks them to support or reject a position on some issue; and a "Critique-an-Argument" question that asks them to evaluate the validity of an argument made by someone else. Both of these tasks measure a student's ability to articulate complex ideas, examine claims and evidence, support ideas with relevant reasons and examples, sustain a coherent discussion, and use standard written English.

A "Make-an-Argument" prompt typically presents an opinion on some issue and asks students to address this issue from any perspective they wish, so long as they provide relevant reasons and examples to explain and support their views. Students have 45 minutes to complete this essay. For example, they might be asked to explain why they agree or disagree with the following:

There is no such thing as "truth" in the media.
The one true thing about the information media is that it exists only to entertain.

A "Critique-an-Argument" prompt asks students to critique an argument by discussing how well reasoned they find it to be (rather than simply agreeing or disagreeing with the position presented). For example, they might be asked to evaluate the following argument:

A well-respected professional journal with a readership that includes elementary school principals recently published the results of a two-year study on childhood obesity. (Obese individuals are usually considered to be those who are 20 percent above their recommended weight for height and age.) This study sampled 50 schoolchildren, ages 5-11, from Smith Elementary School. A fast food restaurant opened near the school just before the study began. After two years, students who remained in the sample group were more likely to be overweight—relative to the national average. Based on this study, the principal of Jones Elementary School decided to confront her school's obesity problem by opposing any fast food restaurant openings near her school.

Scores

The CLA uses two sets of scores. One set is taken from the SAT and ACT. The other set of scores is generated by the CLA. The SAT and ACT scores are used to make fair comparisons across diverse institutions, i.e., comparisons that control for differences in the average academic ability of their entering freshmen classes. To facilitate reporting results across schools, ACT scores were converted (using the standard table in Appendix A) to the scale of measurement that is used to report SAT scores. These converted scores are referred to simply as SAT scores in this report. In fall 2005 and spring 2007 Analytic Writing Task scoring was powered by e-rater[®], an automated scoring technology developed and patented by the Educational Testing Service and licensed to CAE. The Performance Task is scored by a team of professional graders trained and calibrated on the specific task.

Students receive a single score on a CLA task because each task assesses an integrated set of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem solving, and written communication skills. A student's "raw" score on a Performance Task is the total number of points assigned to it by the graders. However, a student can earn more raw score points on some tasks than on others. To adjust for these differences, the raw scores on each task were converted to "scale" scores using the procedures described in Appendix B. This step allows for combining scores across different versions of a given type of task as well as across tasks, such as for the purposes of computing total scores.

IV. Characteristics of Participating Institutions and Students

In the fall 2005 and spring 2007 testing cycles, 32 institutions (“CLA longitudinal schools”) tested enough students twice (freshmen in the fall of 2005 and the same students in the spring of 2007) to provide sufficiently reliable data for the school level analyses and results presented in this report.¹ Table 1 groups CLA longitudinal schools by Basic Carnegie Classification. Compared to the spread of four-year institutions nationally, the distribution of CLA longitudinal schools has a greater proportion of Doctorate-granting Universities, a smaller proportion of Baccalaureate Colleges and roughly the same proportion of Master’s Colleges and Universities.

Table 1: Four-year institutions in the CLA longitudinal study and nation by Carnegie Classification

Basic Carnegie Classification	Nation		CLA longitudinal		
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Doctorate-granting Universities	283	17%	14	44%	<i>Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Carnegie Classifications Data File, July 7, 2006 edition.</i>
Master’s Colleges and Universities	690	40%	12	38%	
Baccalaureate Colleges	737	43%	6	19%	
	1710	100%	32	100%	

Table 2 compares some important characteristics of colleges and universities across the nation with those of the CLA longitudinal schools and suggests that these CLA schools are fairly representative of institutions nationally. Exceptions include a higher proportion of public institutions, slightly higher graduation rates and SAT scores, and larger student bodies.

Table 2: Characteristics of four-year institutions in the CLA longitudinal study and nation

School Characteristic	Nation	CLA	
Percent public	36%	53%	<i>Source: College Results Online dataset, managed by the Education Trust, covers most 4-year Title IV-eligible higher education institutions in the United States. Data were obtained with permission from the Education Trust and constructed from IPEDS and other sources. Because all schools did not report on every measure in the table, the averages and percentages may be based on slightly different denominators.</i>
Percent Historically Black College or University (HBCU)	6%	6%	
Mean percentage of undergraduates receiving Pell grants	33%	32%	
Mean four-year graduation rate	36%	36%	
Mean six-year graduation rate	53%	58%	
Mean first-year retention rate	74%	80%	
Mean Barron’s selectivity rating	3.6	3.7	
Mean estimated median SAT score	1068	1096	
Mean number of FTE undergraduate students (rounded)	4430	8940	
Mean student-related expenditures per FTE student (rounded)	12710	12780	

¹ The analyses discussed in this section focus on those 32 CLA longitudinal institutions where at least 25 students received a CLA total score in both fall 2005 and spring 2007.

With respect to entering ability levels, students participating at the CLA longitudinal schools appeared to be generally representative of their classmates (i.e., full-time enrolled students in the spring of 2007 who began as first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen in the fall of 2005), at least with respect to SAT scores as verified by school registrars at 28 schools. Specifically, across these schools, the mean SAT score of rising juniors taking the CLA was only 12 points higher than that of their classmates: 1132 versus 1120. Additionally, the correlation of these two scores across the 28 schools was extremely high ($r=0.98$). These data suggest that as a group, students tested in the CLA longitudinal study in the spring of 2007 were similar to their classmates on an important measure of student “input,” which increases the confidence in inferences made from results of an institution’s CLA student sample to the population from which it was drawn.

V. Institutional Tables and Figures

CLA longitudinal schools test the same individuals at three points in time: in the fall of 2005, in the spring of 2007, and in the spring of 2009. Students tested in the spring of 2007 (“rising juniors”) at CLA longitudinal schools were scheduled to take one Analytic Writing Task (which includes one Make-an-Argument and one Critique-an-Argument prompt) and one Performance Task.¹ The analyses discussed in this section focus primarily on those CLA longitudinal schools where at least 25 students received a CLA score in both fall 2005 and spring 2007. This requirement was imposed to ensure that the results on a given measure were sufficiently reliable to be interpreted.


Table 3 shows the number of students at your school who completed a CLA measure in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. The counts in this table were used to determine whether your school met the requirement noted above. Counts for the Analytic Writing Task represent students who completed both the Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument prompts.

Table 3: Number of your students with CLA scores in both fall 2005 and spring 2007

	Number of Students
Performance Task	152
Analytic Writing Task	134
Make-an-Argument	139
Critique-an-Argument	139
Total	133

¹ A longitudinal school’s Analytic Writing Task scale score is the mean of its Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument scale scores for those students with complete scores on both prompts. A longitudinal school’s Total scale score is the mean of its Analytic Writing Task and Performance Task scale scores for those students with complete scores on both tasks types at both time points.

Figure 2
 Relationship Between Freshman and Rising Junior Performance (of Repeat Testers)



The vertical y-axis in Figure 2 (above) shows a school's mean CLA Total score for rising juniors. The horizontal axis shows a school's mean CLA Total score for those same students as freshmen. A school's data point is above this line if its rising juniors did better on the CLA than what would be expected; i.e., relative to their freshman CLA scores.

Table 4 indicates whether the rising juniors scored above, at, or below what would be expected given their scores as freshmen. Results are expressed in the form of index scores that correspond to standard errors. Colleges with actual scores between -1.00 and +1.00 standard errors from their expected scores are categorized as being At Expected. Institutions with actual scores greater than one standard error (but less than two standard errors) from their expected scores are in the Above Expected or Below Expected categories (depending on the direction of the deviation). The schools with actual scores greater than two standard errors from their expected scores are in the Well Above Expected or Well Below Expected categories.

Table 4: Value added index and performance level results from your school

	Value Added Index	Performance Level
Performance Task	-0.8	At
Analytic Writing Task	0.4	At
Make-an-Argument	0.1	At
Critique-an-Argument	0.8	At
Total	0.0	At

Table 5 provides summary statistical data on the freshmen and rising juniors who participated at your school. These data represent only those students who were tested both in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. The last two columns of Table 5 are particularly important. The “effect size” column indicates how much change occurred between fall 2005 and spring 2007. The larger the positive effect size, the greater the improvement. Effect sizes greater than 0.50 and 1.00 are generally considered “large” and “very large,” respectively. Negative effect sizes would indicate that the students scored higher as freshmen than they did as rising juniors. The last column of Table 5 shows the correlation between students’ freshman and rising junior scores. A high positive correlation indicates that the students who scored relatively highly as freshmen (relative to their classmates) also tended to score relatively highly as rising juniors. In other words, the improvement between freshman and rising junior scores was fairly consistent across students. A correlation close to 0.00 indicates that those individuals who did well on the CLA as freshmen may or may not have done well on it as rising juniors. For these purposes, correlations below 0.25 are considered low whereas correlations over 0.50 are considered high and those over 0.70 are very high.

Table 5: Comparison of students scores as Freshmen and Rising Juniors for your school

	Freshman		Rising Junior		Difference		Summary Statistics		
	Number of Students	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score*	Standard Deviation	Effect Size	Mean Score Correlation
Performance Task	152	1155	166	1158	172	2	194	0.01	0.35
Analytic Writing Task	134	1105	134	1144	133	39	143	0.24	0.43
Make-an-Argument	139	1111	159	1125	142	14	178	0.08	0.30
Critique-an-Argument	139	1087	172	1155	162	69	193	0.36	0.33
Total	133	1133	125	1155	125	23	127	0.16	0.49

* Mean Difference between Rising Junior and Freshman Scale Scores

Table 6 shows how the results at your school compare to those at other longitudinal schools. For example, was the change in Performance Task scores over the two year study period at your school higher, lower, or about the same as that observed at the other longitudinal schools? It also shows whether the correlation in scores between these two testing times was higher or lower or about the same at your school as it was at the other schools. The direction of the effect size and correlation (+ or -) appears in parentheses after the performance categories, of which there are three: Low (bottom third), Middle (middle third), and High (upper third).

Table 6: Comparison of your school’s Effect Size and Mean Score Correlation with Other Schools

	Performance Categories	
	Effect Size	Mean Score Correlation
Performance Task	Low	High
Analytic Writing Task	High	Low
Make-an-Argument	Middle	Low
Critique-an-Argument	High	Middle
Total	Middle	Middle

Table 7 below provides summary statistics—counts, means, 25th and 75th percentiles, and standard deviations—for students (at all schools) with complete CLA scores in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. The unit of analysis is students. Table 7 also summarizes results for students with complete CLA scores in only the fall of 2005 (“Freshmen Tested Once”). “Retesters as Freshmen” refers to the fall 2005 performance of students who tested again in the spring of 2007. “Retesters as Rising Juniors” refers to the spring 2007 performance of students taking the CLA for the second time.

Table 7: Summary statistics for all students participating in the longitudinal study

	Freshmen Tested Once				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	5851	949	1063	1187	180
Analytic Writing Task	4756	910	1059	1196	159
Make-an-Argument	5059	942	1057	1225	185
Critique-an-Argument	4948	869	1050	1167	178
Total	4721	968	1069	1166	143
SAT Score	5844	930	1060	1190	188

	Retesters as Freshmen				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	3309	985	1127	1250	184
Analytic Writing Task	2885	980	1118	1200	166
Make-an-Argument	3015	942	1115	1225	187
Critique-an-Argument	2981	1018	1113	1316	191
Total	2860	1031	1129	1229	147
SAT Score	3329	1010	1134	1270	188

	Retesters as Rising Juniors				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	3309	1012	1157	1277	207
Analytic Writing Task	2885	980	1125	1267	160
Make-an-Argument	3015	942	1118	1225	180
Critique-an-Argument	2981	1018	1125	1316	179
Total	2860	1033	1147	1252	158
SAT Score	3329	1010	1134	1270	188

Table 8 below provides summary statistics—counts, means, 25th and 75th percentiles, and standard deviations—for students (at all schools) with complete CLA scores both in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. The unit of analysis is schools.

Table 8: Summary statistics for all schools participating in the longitudinal study

	Retesters as Freshmen				
	Number of Schools	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	32	1048	1112	1167	85
Analytic Writing Task	29	1068	1108	1169	90
Make-an-Argument	30	1072	1107	1161	92
Critique-an-Argument	29	1046	1105	1172	90
Total	29	1074	1118	1177	85
SAT Score	32	1045	1116	1193	129

	Retesters as Rising Juniors				
	Number of Schools	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	32	1068	1148	1195	102
Analytic Writing Task	29	1069	1122	1183	94
Make-an-Argument	30	1081	1117	1172	94
Critique-an-Argument	29	1061	1122	1179	98
Total	29	1093	1141	1187	97
SAT Score	32	1045	1116	1193	129

Table 9 below provides summary statistics—counts, means, 25th and 75th percentiles, and standard deviations—for students (at your school) with complete CLA scores both in the fall of 2005 and in the spring of 2007. Table 9 also summarizes results for students with complete CLA scores in only the fall of 2005 (“Freshmen Tested Once”). “Retesters as Freshmen” refers to the fall 2005 performance of students who tested again in the spring of 2007. “Retesters as Rising Juniors” refers to the spring 2007 performance of students taking the CLA for the second time.

Table 9: Summary statistics for students at your school participating in the longitudinal study

	Freshmen Tested Once				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	165	1025	1118	1229	153
Analytic Writing Task	147	977	1069	1196	135
Make-an-Argument	154	942	1074	1225	152
Critique-an-Argument	151	869	1055	1167	163
Total	147	1011	1098	1182	120
SAT Score	163	1030	1110	1180	126

	Retesters as Freshmen				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	152	1035	1155	1251	166
Analytic Writing Task	134	980	1105	1196	134
Make-an-Argument	139	942	1111	1225	159
Critique-an-Argument	139	1018	1087	1167	172
Total	133	1053	1133	1223	125
SAT Score	153	1030	1113	1220	129

	Retesters as Rising Juniors				
	Number of Students	25th Percentile	Mean Scale Score	75th Percentile	Standard Deviation
Performance Task	152	1053	1158	1259	172
Analytic Writing Task	134	1051	1144	1267	133
Make-an-Argument	139	1084	1125	1225	142
Critique-an-Argument	139	1018	1155	1316	162
Total	133	1073	1155	1235	125
SAT Score	153	1030	1113	1220	129

Appendix A

Standard ACT to SAT Conversion Table

To facilitate reporting results across schools, ACT scores were converted (using the standard table below) to the scale of measurement that is used to report SAT scores.

ACT	to	SAT
36		1600
35		1580
34		1520
33		1470
32		1420
31		1380
30		1340
29		1300
28		1260
27		1220
26		1180
25		1140
24		1110
23		1070
22		1030
21		990
20		950
19		910
18		870
17		830
16		780
15		740
14		680
13		620
12		560
11		500

Sources:

“Concordance Between ACT Assessment and Recentered SAT I Sum Scores” by N.J. Dorans, C.F. Lyu, M. Pommerich, and W.M. Houston (1997), *College and University*, 73, 24-31; “Concordance between SAT I and ACT Scores for Individual Students” by D. Schneider and N.J. Dorans, *Research Notes (RN-07)*, College Entrance Examination Board: 1999; “Correspondences between ACT and SAT I Scores” by N.J. Dorans, *College Board Research Report 99-1*, College Entrance Examination Board: 1999; *ETS Research Report 99-2*, Educational Testing Service: 1999.

Appendix B

Procedures for Converting Raw Scores to Scale Scores

There is a separate scoring guide for each Performance Task and the maximum number of points a student can earn may differ across Performance Tasks. To adjust for these differences in maximum possible scores, reader-assigned “raw” scores on a Performance Task were converted (linear transformation) to “scale” scores, just as is done with SAT and ACT scores by their respective organizations.

This process involved transforming the raw scores on a measure to a score distribution that had the same mean and standard deviation as the SAT scores of the students who took that measure. This process also was used with the Analytic Writing Tasks.

This type of scaling essentially involves assigning the highest raw score that was earned on a task by any freshman the same value as the highest SAT score of any freshman who took that task (i.e., not necessarily the same person). The second highest raw score is then assigned the same value as the second highest SAT score, and so on.

As a result of the scaling process, we can combine scores from different tasks to compute a school’s mean Performance Task scale score. The same procedures also were used to compute scale scores for the Analytic Writing Task.

Appendix C

Equations Used to Estimate

Spring 2007 CLA Scores on the Basis of Fall 2005 CLA Scores

	Intercept	Slope	Standard Error	R-square
Performance Task	-50	1.08	47.2	0.79
Analytic Writing Task	198	0.83	58.5	0.63
Make-an-Argument	244	0.79	60.9	0.60
Critique-an-Argument	205	0.83	63.7	0.59
Total Score	55	0.97	51.1	0.73

Appendix D

List of CLA Longitudinal Schools

Auburn University, AL
Belmont University, TN
Bowling Green State University, OH
California State Polytechnic University - Pomona, CA
California State University - Northridge, CA
Carleton College, MN
Central Michigan University, MI
Cleveland State University, OH
CUNY City College, NY
CUNY Herbert H. Lehman College, NY
Fayetteville State University, NC
Grand Valley State University, MI
Loyola University of Chicago, IL
Macalester College, MN
North Carolina A&T State University, NC
Northern Arizona University, AZ
Ohio Northern University, OH
Pace University, NY
Saint Olaf College, MN
Saint Xavier University, IL
Spelman College, GA
Syracuse University, NY
The George Washington University, DC
The Ohio State University, OH
University of California, Riverside, CA
University of Charleston, WV
University of North Carolina at Charlotte, NC
University of Saint Thomas, TX
University of San Diego, CA
University of the Pacific, CA
University of Wyoming, WY
Wagner College, NY
Winston-Salem State University, NC
Winthrop University, SC
Wofford College, SC

Appendix E

CLA Student Data File

In tandem with this report, we provide a CLA Student Data File, which includes over 80 variables across three categories: (1) CLA scores and identifiers; (2) information provided/verified by the registrar; and (3) self-reported information from students in their CLA on-line profile.

We provide student-level information for linking with other data you collect (e.g., from NSSE, CIRP, portfolios, local assessments, course-taking patterns, participation in specialized programs, etc.) to help you hypothesize about campus-specific factors related to overall institutional performance. Student-level scores are not designed to be diagnostic at the individual level and should be considered as only one piece of evidence about a student's skills.

CLA Scores and Identifiers	Registrar Data	Self-Reported Data
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fall 2005 and Spring 2007 CLA scores for Performance Task, Analytic Writing Task, Make-an-Argument, Critique-an-Argument, and Total CLA Score (depending on the number of tasks taken and completeness of responses): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CLA scale scores; - Student Performance Level categories (i.e., well below expected, below expected, at expected, above expected, well above expected) if CLA scale score and SAT equivalent scores are available; - Percentile Rank in the CLA (among students in the same class year; based on scale score); and - Percentile Rank at School (among students in the same class year; based on scale score). • e-rater® raw scores for Make-an-Argument and/or Critique-an-Argument • Unique CLA numeric identifiers • Name (first, middle initial, last), E-mail address, SSN/Student ID • Year, Administration (Fall or Spring), Type of Test (90 or 180-minute), Date of test • Average total time spent on CLA in the spring of 2007 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Class • High School GPA • Freshman Year GPA • Cumulative Undergraduate GPA (through fall 2006) • Transfer Student Status • Credit Hours (only for coursework at institution) (through fall 2006) • Total Credit Hours (through fall 2006) • Credit Hours (at institution) as percent (%) of total credits needed for graduation (through fall 2006) • SAT Equivalent Score (SAT composite or converted ACT composite) • SAT I Scores • ACT Scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age • Gender • Race/Ethnicity • Primary and Secondary Academic Major (34 categories) • Field of Study (6 categories; based on primary academic major) • English as primary language • Total years at school • Attended school as Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

collegiate
learning
assessment

**collegiate
learning
assessment**