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History

- Conceptualized since 2005
- Expert reviewed in 2010
- Piloted to an institutional sample 2010
- Piloted to national sample 2011
- Faculty survey coming out in 2012
Research Goals

- Explore the factors influencing campus-level institutional culture of assessment.
- Determine tactics that can be employed for a more purposeful process of maintaining or changing assessment culture.
Instrument

- SHSU IRB Protocol 2011-08-015
- Maki’s (2010) Principles of an Inclusive Commitment to Assessment
- 21 questions with 43 data points, randomly ordered where possible
- Five “phases”
  - Identifying Respondent’s Role/Chief Assessment Officer
  - Purpose for assessment
  - Assessment Culture Scales
  - Support, Resistance, or Indifference Rankings
  - Consent to follow up studies/contact
Sampling

* Desire to Build a Nationally-Representative Sample
* Challenges in Identifying Population
  * Higher Ed Directory © ®
* Stratified Sample Build with matrix
  * Institutional Size (FTE)
  * Region of the country reflecting accreditation region
  * Carnegie Basic Classification
    * Attention paid to 2-year and 4-year status
* Total Meeting these criteria- 2,619
More on Sampling Method

- See Kuh and Ikenberry (2009).
- Addition of sampling to avoid lengthy searches for contact information.
- Matrix sampled at the cell level
- Oversampled by a factor of 3
- 1026 email addresses were found
- 17 “Phone only” contacts
- 109 email addresses “bounced back”
902 useable email addresses of IR and/or Assessment Directors
Email was sent out Nov. 1, 2011
Three “3-Week” Reminders
Closed near the end of Fall 2011 semester
Participants could recommend a Chief Assessment Officer for additional surveying
* 15 Recommendations were sent a survey
Total survey sample = 917 participants
Descriptive Statistics

- 317 Consenting Respondents
- 34.57% Response Rate
- Suggests that results are representative at the 95% confidence level and confidence interval of 5.
  - 271 Respondent threshold.
- Cautions and limitations still abound!
Results

Role at Institution
Are you the CAO?

- Yes. I am the Chief Assessment Officer. 31%
- Yes. However, I am NOT the Chief Assessment Officer. 10%
- I am not sure. 1%
- No. Several individuals oversee assessment or our assessment officer has many additional responsibilities. 54%
- No one at our institution directs assessment. 4%
**Role at Institution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty or Administrator?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=317</td>
<td>(61 respondents skipped this question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Respondents considered themselves &quot;primarily a faculty member&quot;</td>
<td>239 Respondents considered themselves &quot;primarily an administrator&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>93.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Your Responsibility to Meet with Faculty Regarding Assessment?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
<th>No one here with that responsibility.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 or 2.7%</td>
<td>20 or 7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 or 29.3%</td>
<td>159 or 60.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Support, Resistance, or Indifference to Assessment

Group Mean: 4.77
Results

Percent Supportive, Resistance, Indifferent/Unaware

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>% Supportive</th>
<th>% Resistant</th>
<th>% Indifferent/Unaware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Trustees</td>
<td>69.51</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>30.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>91.59</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>90.63</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs/services staff</td>
<td>88.50</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Acad. Senate Leadership</td>
<td>78.92</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/Fundraising Officers</td>
<td>53.42</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>42.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni groups</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>73.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advisors</td>
<td>73.18</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>19.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government leaders</td>
<td>49.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>49.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment Culture Scales

- Descriptive Statistics of selected questions are provided at your table.
- In a small group setting, discuss the findings and prepare comments for the room.
Factors of Influence

* Five Potential Factors
  * Clear Foundation of Assessment Across Community
  * Demonstration of Value
  * Support and Recognition of Assessment Involvement
  * Meaningful Connection to Change Processes
  * Sense of Vitality
Discussion

* How can these factors influence your practice of assessment?
* How do they help you theorize about new avenues in assessment success?
* How do these factors reaffirm or reorient your perspective on why assessment is done?
Future Research

* Complimentary Faculty Survey
* Further refinement of questions
  * Construct Validity
  * Face Validity
* New factors?
* New populations.