

# CLIA

FALL 2010 CLA OVERVIEW

Your Fall 2010 Results consist of three components:

- CLA Overview
- CLA Institutional Report
- CLA Student Data File

### Overview

---

This Fall 2010 Overview introduces readers to the CLA and offers guidance on interpretation of results. It also provides details on CLA tasks, scoring and scaling, and the overall sample of participating institutions.

- 1 Introduction to the CLA (p. 3)
- 2 Methods (p. 4-5)
- 3 Task Overview (p. 6-9)
- 4 Diagnostic Guidance (p. 10)
- 5 Scoring Criteria (p. 11-13)
- 6 Scoring Process (p. 14)
- 7 Scaling Procedures (p. 15-16)
- 8 Percentile Look-up Tables (p. 17-18)
- 9 Sample of CLA Institutions (p. 19-23)
- 10 Student Data File (p. 24)
- 11 Moving Forward (p. 25)
- 12 CAE Board of Trustees and Officers (p. 26)

### Report

---

Your Fall 2010 CLA Institutional Report was distributed separately as a two-page document. Your report summarizes CLA performance at your institution and across all CLA institutions as well as key characteristics of your student sample.

### Student Data File

---

Your Fall 2010 CLA Student Data File was distributed separately as a password-protected Excel file. Your Student Data File may be linked with other data sources to generate hypotheses for additional research.

The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) is a major initiative of the Council for Aid to Education.

The CLA offers a value-added, constructed-response approach to the assessment of higher-order skills, such as critical thinking and written communication. Hundreds of institutions and hundreds of thousands of students have participated in the CLA to date.

The institution—not the student—is the primary unit of analysis. The CLA is designed to measure an institution's contribution, or value added, to the development of higher-order skills. This approach allows an institution to compare its student learning results on the CLA with learning results at similarly selective institutions.

The CLA is intended to assist faculty, school administrators, and others interested in programmatic change to improve teaching and learning, particularly with respect to strengthening higher-order skills.

Included in the CLA are Performance Tasks and Analytic Writing Tasks. Performance Tasks present realistic problems that require students to analyze complex materials. Several different types of materials are used that vary in credibility, relevance to the task, and other characteristics. Students' written responses to the tasks are graded to assess their abilities to think critically, reason analytically, solve problems, and write clearly and persuasively.

The CLA helps campuses follow a continuous improvement model that positions faculty as central actors in the link between assessment and teaching/learning.

The continuous improvement model requires multiple indicators beyond the CLA because no single test can serve as the benchmark for all student learning in higher education. There are, however, certain skills judged to be important by most faculty and administrators across

virtually all institutions; indeed, the higher-order skills the CLA focuses on fall into this category.

The signaling quality of the CLA is important because institutions need to have a frame of reference for where they stand and how much progress their students have made relative to the progress of students at other colleges. Yet, the CLA is not about ranking institutions. Rather, it is about highlighting differences between them that can lead to improvements. The CLA is an instrument designed to contribute directly to the improvement of teaching and learning. In this respect it is in a league of its own.

The CLA uses constructed-response tasks and value-added methodology to evaluate your students' performance reflecting the following higher-order skills: Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation, Writing Effectiveness, Writing Mechanics, and Problem Solving.

Schools test a sample of entering students (freshmen) in the fall and exiting students (seniors) in the spring. Students take one Performance Task or a combination of one Make-an-Argument prompt and one Critique-an-Argument prompt.

The interim results that your institution receives after the fall testing window reflect the performance of your entering students.

Your institution's interim institutional report presents

information on each of the CLA task types, including means (averages), standard deviations (a measure of the spread of scores in the sample), and percentile ranks (the percentage of schools that had lower performance than yours). Also included is distributional information for each of the CLA subscores: Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation, Writing Effectiveness, Writing Mechanics, and Problem Solving.

This summer, your institution will receive a CLA value-added institutional report, which is based on the performance of your entering and exiting students.\* Value-added modeling is often viewed as an equitable way of estimating an institution's contribution to learning. Simply comparing average achievement of all schools tends to paint selective institutions in a favorable light and discount the educational efficacy of schools

admitting students from weaker academic backgrounds. Value-added modeling addresses this issue by providing scores that can be interpreted as relative to institutions testing students of similar entering academic ability. This allows all schools, not just selective ones, to demonstrate their relative educational efficacy.

The CLA value-added estimation approach employs a statistical technique known as hierarchical linear modeling (HLM).\*\* Under this value-added methodology, a school's value-added score indicates the degree to which the observed senior mean CLA score meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations established by (1) seniors' Entering Academic Ability (EAA) scores\*\*\* and (2) the mean CLA performance of freshmen at that school, which serves as a control for selection effects not covered by EAA. Only

\* Note that the methods employed by the Community College Learning Assessment (CCLA) differ from those presented here. A description of those methods is available upon request.

\*\* A description of the differences between the original OLS model and the enhanced HLM model is available upon request.

\*\*\* SAT Math + Verbal, ACT Composite, or Scholastic Level Exam (SLE) scores on the SAT scale. Hereinafter referred to as Entering Academic Ability (EAA).

students with EAA scores are included in institutional analyses.

When the average performance of seniors at a school is substantially better than expected, this school is said to have high “value added.” To illustrate, consider several schools admitting students with similar average performance on general academic ability tests (e.g., the SAT or ACT) and on tests of higher-order skills (e.g., the CLA). If, after four years of college education, the seniors at one school perform better on the CLA than is typical for schools admitting similar students, one can infer that greater gains in critical thinking and writing skills occurred at the highest performing school. Note that a low (negative) value-added score does not necessarily indicate that no gain occurred between freshman and senior year; however, it does suggest that the gain was lower than would

typically be observed at schools testing students of similar entering academic ability.

Value-added scores are placed on a standardized ( $z$ -score) scale and assigned performance levels. Schools that fall between -1.00 and +1.00 are classified as “near expected,” between +1.00 and +2.00 are “above expected,” between -1.00 and -2.00 are “below expected,” above +2.00 are “well above expected,” and below -2.00 are “well below expected.” Value-added estimates are also accompanied by confidence intervals, which provide information on the precision of the estimates; narrow confidence intervals indicate that the estimate is more precise, while wider intervals indicate less precision.

Our analyses include results from all CLA institutions, regardless of sample size and sampling strategy. Therefore, we encourage you to

apply due caution when interpreting your results if you tested a very small sample of students or believe that the students in your institution’s sample are not representative of the larger student body.

Moving forward, we will continue to employ methodological advances to maximize the precision of our value-added estimates. We will also continue developing ways to augment the value of CLA results for the improvement of teaching and learning.

### Introduction

---

The CLA consists of a Performance Task and an Analytic Writing Task. Students are randomly assigned to take one or the other. The Analytic Writing Task includes a pair of prompts called Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument.

All CLA tasks are administered online and consist of open-ended prompts that require constructed responses. There are no multiple-choice questions.

The CLA requires that students use critical thinking and written communication skills to perform cognitively demanding tasks. The integration of these skills mirrors the requirements of serious thinking and writing tasks faced in life outside of the classroom.

## Performance Task

Each Performance Task requires students to use an integrated set of higher-order skills to answer several open-ended questions about a hypothetical but realistic situation. In addition to directions and questions, each Performance Task 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 drop-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. Upon completing a question, the student clicks through to the next question.

No two Performance Tasks assess the exact same combination of skills. Some ask students to identify and then compare and contrast the strengths and limitations of alternative hypotheses, points of view, courses of action, etc. To perform these and other tasks, students may have to weigh different types of evidence, evaluate the credibility of various documents, spot possible bias, and identify questionable or critical assumptions.

Performance Tasks may also 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 arguments from emotional ones 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.

### Analytic Writing Task

---

Students write responses to two types of essay tasks: a Make-an-Argument prompt that asks them to support or reject a position on some issue; and a Critique-an-Argument prompt that asks them to evaluate the validity of an argument made by someone else. Both of these tasks measure a student's skill in articulating complex ideas, examining claims and evidence, supporting ideas with relevant reasons and examples, sustaining a coherent discussion, and using standard written English.

### Make-an-Argument

---

A Make-an-Argument prompt typically presents an opinion on some issue and asks students to write, in 45 minutes, a persuasive analytic essay to support a position on the issue. Key elements include: establishing a thesis or a position on an issue; maintaining the thesis throughout the essay; supporting the thesis with relevant and persuasive examples (e.g., from personal experience, history, art, literature, pop culture, or current events); anticipating and countering opposing arguments to the position, fully developing ideas, examples, and arguments; organizing the structure of the essay to maintain the flow of the argument (e.g., paragraphing, ordering of ideas and sentences within paragraphs, use of transitions); employing varied sentence structure and advanced vocabulary.

### Critique-an-Argument

---

A Critique-an-Argument prompt asks students, in 30 minutes, to evaluate the reasoning used in an argument (rather than simply agreeing or disagreeing with the position presented). Key elements of the essay include: identifying a variety of logical flaws or fallacies in a specific argument; explaining how or why the logical flaws affect the conclusions in that argument; and presenting a critique in a written response that is grammatically correct, organized, well-developed, and logically sound.

### Example Performance Task

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.

### Example Document Library

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

### Example 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?

### Example Make-an-Argument

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.

### Example Critique-an-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.

CLA results operate as a signaling tool of overall institutional performance on tasks that measure higher-order skills. Examining performance across CLA task types can serve as an initial diagnostic exercise. The three types of CLA tasks—Performance Task, Make-an-Argument, and Critique-an-Argument—differ in the combination of skills necessary to perform well.

The Make-an-Argument and Critique-an-Argument tasks measure Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation, Writing Effectiveness, and Writing Mechanics. The Performance Task measures Problem Solving in addition to the three aforementioned skills. Each of the skills are assessed in slightly different ways within the context of each task type. For example, in the context of the Performance Task and the Critique-an-Argument task, Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation involves interpreting,

analyzing, and evaluating the quality of information. In the Make-an-Argument task, Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation involves stating a position, providing valid reasons to support the writer's position, and considering and possibly refuting alternative viewpoints.

Subscores are assigned on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 6 (highest). Subscores are not directly comparable to one another because they are not adjusted for difficulty like CLA scale scores. The subscores remain unadjusted because they are intended to facilitate criterion-referenced interpretations. For example, a “4” in Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation means that a response had certain qualities (e.g., “Identifies a few facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments”), and any adjustment to that score would compromise the interpretation.

Still, the ability to make claims like “Our students seem to be doing better in Writing Effectiveness than in Problem Solving on the Performance Task” is clearly desirable. This can be done by comparing each subscore distribution to its corresponding reference distribution displayed in Figure 4 of your institutional report. You can support claims like the one above if you see, for example, that students are performing above average in Writing Effectiveness, but not in Problem Solving on the Performance Task.

Please examine the results presented in Figure 4 and Table 5 of your institutional report in combination with the *Scoring Criteria* in the next section to explore the areas where your students may need improvement.

**Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation**

Interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating the quality of information. This entails identifying information that is relevant to a problem, highlighting connected and conflicting information, detecting flaws in logic and questionable assumptions, and explaining why information is credible, unreliable, or limited.

**Writing Effectiveness**

Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by providing elaboration on facts or ideas (e.g., explaining how evidence bears on the problem, providing examples, and emphasizing especially convincing evidence).

**Writing Mechanics**

Facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax (sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage).

**Problem Solving**

Considering and weighing information from discrete sources to make decisions (draw a conclusion and/or propose a course of action) that logically follow from valid arguments, evidence, and examples. Considering the implications of decisions and suggesting additional research when appropriate.

6

- Identifies most facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library. Provides analysis that goes beyond the obvious.
- Demonstrates accurate understanding of a large body of information from the Document Library.
- Makes several accurate claims about the quality of information.

- Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's arguments.
- Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and clearly cites sources of information.

- Demonstrates outstanding control of grammatical conventions.
- Consistently writes well-constructed, complex sentences with varied structure and length.
- Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied.

- Provides a decision and a solid rationale based on credible evidence from a variety of sources. Weighs other options, but presents the decision as best given the available evidence.
- When applicable:
- Proposes a course of action that follows logically from the conclusion. Considers implications.
  - Recognizes the need for additional research. Recommends specific research that would address most unanswered questions.

5

- Identifies several facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library.
- Demonstrates accurate understanding of much of the Document Library content.
- Makes a few accurate claims about the quality of information.

- Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's arguments.
- Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas related to each argument and cites sources of information.

- Demonstrates very good control of grammatical conventions.
- Consistently writes well-constructed sentences with varied structure and length.
- Uses varied and sometimes advanced vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas.

- Provides a decision and a solid rationale based largely on credible evidence from multiple sources and discounts alternatives.
- When applicable:
- Proposes a course of action that follows logically from the conclusion. May consider implications.
  - Recognizes the need for additional research. Suggests research that would address some unanswered questions.

4

- Identifies a few facts or ideas that support or refute all major arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library.
- Briefly demonstrates accurate understanding of important Document Library content, but disregards some information.
- Makes very few accurate claims about the quality of information.

- Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's arguments and logic of those arguments apparent but not obvious.
- Provides valid elaboration on facts or ideas several times and cites sources of information.

- Demonstrates good control of grammatical conventions with few errors.
- Writes well-constructed sentences with some varied structure and length.
- Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety.

- Provides a decision and credible evidence to back it up. Possibly does not account for credible, contradictory evidence. May attempt to discount alternatives.
- When applicable:
- Proposes a course of action that follows logically from the conclusion. May briefly consider implications.
  - Recognizes the need for additional research. Suggests research that would address an unanswered question.

3

- Identifies a few facts or ideas that support or refute several arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library.
- Disregards important information or makes minor misinterpretations of information. May restate information "as is."
- Rarely, if ever, makes claims about the quality of information and may present some unreliable evidence as credible.

- Provides limited or somewhat unclear arguments. Presents relevant information in each response, but that information is not woven into arguments.
- Provides elaboration on facts or ideas a few times, some of which is valid. Sources of information are sometimes unclear.

- Demonstrates fair control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors.
- Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to have similar structure and length.
- Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas adequately but lacks variety.

- Provides or implies a decision and some reason to favor it, but the rationale may be contradicted by unaccounted for evidence.
- When applicable:
- Briefly proposes a course of action, but some aspects may not follow logically from the conclusion.
  - May recognize the need for additional research. Any suggested research tends to be vague or would not adequately address unanswered questions.

2

- Identifies very few facts or ideas that support or refute arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library.
- Disregards or misinterprets much of the Document Library. May restate information "as is."
- Does not make claims about the quality of information and presents some unreliable information as credible.

- Provides limited, invalid, overstated, or very unclear arguments. May present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points.
- Any elaboration on facts or ideas tends to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's opinion). Sources of information are often unclear.

- Demonstrates poor control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors and some distracting errors.
- Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand.
- Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.

- Provides or implies a decision, but very little rationale is provided or it is based heavily on unreliable evidence.
- When applicable:
- Briefly proposes a course of action, but some aspects do not follow logically from the conclusion.
  - May recognize the need for additional research. Any suggested research is vague or would not adequately address unanswered questions.

1

- Does not identify facts or ideas that support or refute arguments (or salient features of all objects to be classified) presented in the Document Library or provides no evidence of analysis.
- Disregards or severely misinterprets important information.
- Does not make claims about the quality of evidence and bases response on unreliable information.

- Does not develop convincing arguments. Writing may be disorganized and confusing.
- Does not provide elaboration on facts or ideas.

- Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical conventions with many errors that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge.
- Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand.
- Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.

- Provides no clear decision or no valid rationale for the decision.
- When applicable:
- Does not propose a course of action that follows logically from the conclusion.
  - Does not recognize the need for additional research or does not suggest research that would address unanswered questions.

### Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation

Stating a position, providing valid reasons to support the writer's position, and demonstrating an understanding of the complexity of the issue by considering and possibly refuting alternative viewpoints.

### Writing Effectiveness

Constructing an organized and logically cohesive argument. Strengthening the writer's position by elaborating on the reasons for that position (e.g., providing evidence, examples, and logical reasoning).

### Writing Mechanics

Facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax (sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage).

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Asserts an insightful position and provides multiple (at least 4) sound reasons to justify it.</li> <li>Provides analysis that reflects a thorough consideration of the complexity of the issue. Possibly refutes major counterarguments or considers contexts integral to the issue (e.g., ethical, cultural, social, political).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's argument.</li> <li>Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on each reason for the writer's position.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates outstanding control of grammatical conventions.</li> <li>Consistently writes well-constructed, complex sentences with varied structure and length.</li> <li>Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied.</li> </ul>   |
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States a thoughtful position and provides multiple (at least 3) sound reasons to support it.</li> <li>Provides analysis that reflects some consideration of the complexity of the issue. Possibly considers contexts integral to the issue (e.g., ethical, cultural, social, political).</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's argument.</li> <li>Provides valid elaboration on each reason for the writer's position.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates very good control of grammatical conventions.</li> <li>Consistently writes well-constructed sentences with varied structure and length.</li> <li>Uses varied and sometimes advanced vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas.</li> </ul>   |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States a clear position and some (2-3) sound reasons to support it.</li> <li>Provides some careful analysis, but it lacks consideration of the issue's complexity.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's argument and its logic apparent but not obvious.</li> <li>Provides valid elaboration on reasons for the writer's position several times.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates good control of grammatical conventions with few errors.</li> <li>Writes well-constructed sentences with some varied structure and length.</li> <li>Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety.</li> </ul>  |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States or implies a position and provides few (1-2) reasons to support it.</li> <li>Provides some superficial analysis of the issue.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a limited or somewhat unclear argument. Presents relevant information, but that information is not woven into an argument.</li> <li>Provides valid elaboration on reasons for the writer's position a few times.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates fair control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors.</li> <li>Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to have similar structure and length.</li> <li>Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas adequately but lacks variety.</li> </ul>   |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States or implies a position and provides vague or very few reasons to support it.</li> <li>Provides little analysis, and that analysis may reflect an oversimplification of the issue.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides limited, invalid, overstated, or very unclear argument. May present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points.</li> <li>Any elaboration on reasons for the writer's position tend to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's opinion).</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates poor control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors and some distracting errors.</li> <li>Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand.</li> <li>Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.</li> </ul>                              |
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States an unclear position (if any) and fails to provide reasons to support it.</li> <li>Provides very little evidence of analysis. May not understand the issue.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fails to develop a convincing argument. The writing may be disorganized and confusing.</li> <li>Fails to provide elaboration on reasons for the writer's position.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical conventions with many errors that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge.</li> <li>Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand.</li> <li>Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.</li> </ul> |

**Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation**

Interpreting, analyzing, and evaluating the quality of information. This entails highlighting conflicting information, detecting flaws in logic and questionable assumptions, and explaining why information is credible, unreliable, or limited.

**Writing Effectiveness**

Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by elaborating on deficiencies in the argument (e.g., providing explanations and examples).

**Writing Mechanics**

Facility with the conventions of standard written English (agreement, tense, capitalization, punctuation, and spelling) and control of the English language, including syntax (sentence structure) and diction (word choice and usage).

6

- Demonstrates accurate understanding of the complete argument.
- Identifies many (at least 5) deficiencies in the argument and provides analysis that goes beyond the obvious.

- Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's critique.
- Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration for each identified deficiency.

- Demonstrates outstanding control of grammatical conventions.
- Consistently writes well-constructed, complex sentences with varied structure and length.
- Displays adept use of vocabulary that is precise, advanced, and varied.

5

- Demonstrates accurate understanding of much of the argument.
- Identifies many (at least 4) deficiencies in the argument.

- Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's critique.
- Provides valid elaboration for each identified deficiency.

- Demonstrates very good control of grammatical conventions.
- Consistently writes well-constructed sentences with varied structure and length.
- Uses varied and sometimes advanced vocabulary that effectively communicates ideas.

4

- Demonstrates accurate understanding of several aspects of the argument, but disregards a few.
- Identifies several (at least 3) deficiencies in the argument.

- Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's critique and its logic apparent but not obvious.
- Provides valid elaboration on identified deficiencies several times.

- Demonstrates good control of grammatical conventions with few errors.
- Writes well-constructed sentences with some varied structure and length.
- Uses vocabulary that clearly communicates ideas but lacks variety.

3

- Disregards several aspects of the argument or makes minor misinterpretations of the argument.
- Identifies a few (2-3) deficiencies in the argument.

- Provides a limited or somewhat unclear critique. Presents relevant information, but that information is not woven into an argument.
- Provides valid elaboration on identified deficiencies a few times.

- Demonstrates fair control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors.
- Writes sentences that read naturally but tend to have similar structure and length.
- Uses vocabulary that communicates ideas adequately but lacks variety.

2

- Disregards or misinterprets much of the information in the argument.
- Identifies very few (1-2) deficiencies in the argument and may accept unreliable evidence as credible.

- Provides limited, invalid, overstated, or very unclear critique. May present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points.
- Any elaboration on identified deficiencies tends to be vague, irrelevant, inaccurate, or unreliable (e.g., based entirely on writer's opinion).

- Demonstrates poor control of grammatical conventions with frequent minor errors and some distracting errors.
- Consistently writes sentences with similar structure and length, and some may be difficult to understand.
- Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary may be used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.

1

- Disregards or severely misinterprets important information in the argument.
- Fails to identify deficiencies in the argument or provides no evidence of critical analysis.

- Fails to develop a convincing critique or agrees entirely with the flawed argument. The writing may be disorganized and confusing.
- Fails to provide elaboration on identified deficiencies.

- Demonstrates minimal control of grammatical conventions with many errors that make the response difficult to read or provides insufficient evidence to judge.
- Writes sentences that are repetitive or incomplete, and some are difficult to understand.
- Uses simple vocabulary, and some vocabulary is used inaccurately or in a way that makes meaning unclear.

The CLA uses a combination of automated and human scoring.

Beginning in fall 2010, we rely primarily on Intelligent Essay Assessor (IEA) for scoring. IEA is the automated scoring engine developed by Pearson Knowledge Technologies to evaluate the meaning of text, not just writing mechanics. Pearson has trained IEA for the CLA using a broad range of real CLA responses and scores to ensure its consistency with scores generated by human scorers.

Though the majority of scoring is handled by IEA, some responses are scored by trained human scorers. IEA identifies unusual responses, which are automatically sent to the human scoring queue. In addition, ten percent of responses are scored by both IEA and humans in order to continually evaluate the quality of scoring.

All scorer candidates undergo rigorous training in order to become certified CLA scorers. Training includes an orientation to the prompts and scoring rubrics/guides, repeated practice grading a wide range of student responses, and extensive feedback and discussion after scoring each response. After participating in training, scorers complete a reliability check where they score the same set of student responses. Scorers with low agreement or reliability (determined by comparisons of raw score means, standard deviations and correlations among the scorers) are either further coached or removed from scoring.

Each response receives subscores in the categories of Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation, Writing Effectiveness, and Writing Mechanics. An additional scale, Problem Solving, is used to evaluate

only the Performance Tasks. Subscores are assigned on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 6 (highest). For all task types, blank responses or responses that are entirely unrelated to the task (e.g., writing about what they had for breakfast) are flagged for removal from results.

Because the prompts (specific tasks within each task type) differ in the possible arguments and pieces of information students can or should use in their responses, prompt-specific guidance is provided to scorers in addition to the scoring criteria that appear in the previous section.

To facilitate reporting results across schools, ACT scores were converted (using the ACT-SAT crosswalk to the right) to the scale of measurement used to report SAT scores.

For institutions where some students do not have ACT or SAT scores, we make available the Scholastic Level Exam (SLE), a short-form cognitive ability measure, as part of the CLA. The SLE is produced by Wonderlic, Inc. SLE scores were converted to the SAT scale using data from 1,148 students participating in spring 2006 that had both SAT and SLE scores.

These converted scores (both ACT to SAT and SLE to SAT) and SAT scores are referred to as Entering Academic Ability (EAA) scores.

### Standard ACT to SAT Crosswalk

| ACT | to | SAT  |
|-----|----|------|
| 36  |    | 1600 |
| 35  |    | 1560 |
| 34  |    | 1510 |
| 33  |    | 1460 |
| 32  |    | 1420 |
| 31  |    | 1380 |
| 30  |    | 1340 |
| 29  |    | 1300 |
| 28  |    | 1260 |
| 27  |    | 1220 |
| 26  |    | 1190 |
| 25  |    | 1150 |
| 24  |    | 1110 |
| 23  |    | 1070 |
| 22  |    | 1030 |
| 21  |    | 990  |
| 20  |    | 950  |
| 19  |    | 910  |
| 18  |    | 870  |
| 17  |    | 830  |
| 16  |    | 790  |
| 15  |    | 740  |
| 14  |    | 690  |
| 13  |    | 640  |
| 12  |    | 590  |
| 11  |    | 530  |

Source:

ACT (2008). *ACT/College Board Joint Statement*. Retrieved from <http://www.act.org/aap/concordance/pdf/report.pdf>

For each task, raw subscores are summed to produce a raw total score. Because not all tasks have the exact same level of difficulty, raw total scores from the different tasks are converted to a common scale of measurement. This process results in scale scores that reflect comparable levels of proficiency across tasks. For example, a given CLA scale score indicates approximately the same percentile rank regardless of the task on which it was earned. This feature of the CLA scale scores allows combining scores from different tasks to compute a school's mean scale score for each task type as well as a total average scale score across types.

A linear scale transformation is used to convert raw scores to scale scores. This process results in a scale score distribution with the same mean and standard deviation as the SAT (or converted ACT) scores of the college freshmen who took that measure. This type of scaling preserves the shape of the raw score distribution and maintains the relative standing of students. For

example, the student with the highest raw score on a task will also have the highest scale score on that task, the student with the next highest raw score will be assigned the next highest scale score, and so on.

This type of scaling makes it such that a very high raw score earned on the task (not necessarily the highest possible score) corresponds approximately to the highest SAT (or converted ACT) score of any freshman who took that task. Similarly, a very low raw score earned on a task would be assigned a scale score value that is close to the lowest SAT (or converted ACT) score of any freshman who took that task. On rare occasions that students achieve exceptionally high or low raw scores, this scaling procedure may produce scale scores that fall outside the normal SAT (Math + Verbal) score range of 400 to 1600.

From fall 2006 to spring 2010, CAE used the same scaling equations for each assessment cycle in order to facilitate year-to-year comparisons.

With the introduction of new scoring criteria in fall 2010, raw scores are now on a different scale than they were in previous years, which makes it necessary to revise the scaling equations. Under the new scaling equations, fall 2010 responses tend to receive somewhat lower scores than responses of the same quality would have received in previous years. If you are interested in drawing comparisons between the average CLA scale scores in your current institutional report and those reported prior to fall 2010, we encourage you to use the equation below to convert pre-fall 2010 scale scores to current scale scores. The correlation between institution average scores on the old and new score scales is .99, and this equation characterizes the strong linear relationship between those scores. The equation can apply to all institution-level score types: Total, Performance Task, Analytic Writing Task, Make-an-Argument, and Critique-an-Argument.

$$score_{\text{new}} = 102.29 + (0.8494 \cdot score_{\text{old}})$$

## Freshman CLA Scores, 50th-99th Percentiles

| Percentile | Total CLA Score | Performance Task | Analytic Writing Task | Make-an-Argument | Critique-an-Argument | EAA  |
|------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------|
| 99         | 1276            | 1277             | 1278                  | 1264             | 1337                 | 1354 |
| 98         | 1244            | 1250             | 1246                  | 1240             | 1288                 | 1284 |
| 97         | 1227            | 1241             | 1237                  | 1232             | 1252                 | 1267 |
| 96         | 1220            | 1219             | 1229                  | 1223             | 1225                 | 1255 |
| 95         | 1205            | 1211             | 1225                  | 1217             | 1219                 | 1236 |
| 94         | 1202            | 1207             | 1208                  | 1210             | 1216                 | 1229 |
| 93         | 1195            | 1198             | 1199                  | 1194             | 1207                 | 1220 |
| 92         | 1188            | 1182             | 1196                  | 1191             | 1193                 | 1216 |
| 91         | 1179            | 1177             | 1189                  | 1184             | 1183                 | 1214 |
| 90         | 1175            | 1176             | 1186                  | 1183             | 1181                 | 1207 |
| 89         | 1171            | 1175             | 1177                  | 1176             | 1171                 | 1188 |
| 88         | 1169            | 1170             | 1173                  | 1172             | 1170                 | 1184 |
| 87         | 1156            | 1167             | 1165                  | 1169             | 1162                 | 1180 |
| 86         | 1151            | 1155             | 1158                  | 1166             | 1160                 | 1177 |
| 85         | 1149            | 1152             | 1153                  | 1161             | 1155                 | 1175 |
| 84         | 1139            | 1150             | 1147                  | 1154             | 1150                 | 1171 |
| 83         | 1135            | 1140             | 1143                  | 1145             | 1144                 | 1161 |
| 82         | 1134            | 1135             | 1140                  | 1137             | 1141                 | 1153 |
| 81         | 1132            | 1133             | 1137                  | 1134             | 1130                 | 1148 |
| 80         | 1131            | 1130             | 1132                  | 1128             | 1128                 | 1139 |
| 79         | 1128            | 1128             | 1125                  | 1123             | 1126                 | 1138 |
| 78         | 1124            | 1126             | 1122                  | 1121             | 1125                 | 1134 |
| 77         | 1123            | 1121             | 1120                  | 1121             | 1124                 | 1131 |
| 76         | 1122            | 1120             | 1119                  | 1120             | 1123                 | 1125 |
| 75         | 1117            | 1115             | 1115                  | 1118             | 1122                 | 1118 |
| 74         | 1116            | 1114             | 1114                  | 1115             | 1119                 | 1113 |
| 73         | 1115            | 1110             | 1114                  | 1113             | 1115                 | 1107 |
| 72         | 1112            | 1108             | 1113                  | 1108             | 1114                 | 1106 |
| 71         | 1110            | 1106             | 1111                  | 1106             | 1110                 | 1103 |
| 70         | 1107            | 1101             | 1108                  | 1104             | 1108                 | 1102 |
| 69         | 1102            | 1098             | 1107                  | 1102             | 1105                 | 1100 |
| 68         | 1099            | 1092             | 1106                  | 1101             | 1103                 | 1093 |
| 67         | 1096            | 1091             | 1103                  | 1097             | 1101                 | 1083 |
| 66         | 1094            | 1088             | 1101                  | 1096             | 1097                 | 1082 |
| 65         | 1089            | 1082             | 1095                  | 1095             | 1092                 | 1078 |
| 64         | 1085            | 1080             | 1094                  | 1094             | 1090                 | 1077 |
| 63         | 1083            | 1077             | 1089                  | 1089             | 1086                 | 1077 |
| 62         | 1079            | 1075             | 1084                  | 1088             | 1084                 | 1076 |
| 61         | 1077            | 1073             | 1082                  | 1084             | 1081                 | 1072 |
| 60         | 1076            | 1072             | 1081                  | 1078             | 1080                 | 1070 |
| 59         | 1074            | 1070             | 1079                  | 1075             | 1075                 | 1069 |
| 58         | 1073            | 1069             | 1075                  | 1068             | 1072                 | 1068 |
| 57         | 1070            | 1066             | 1072                  | 1064             | 1071                 | 1067 |
| 56         | 1069            | 1065             | 1071                  | 1062             | 1069                 | 1063 |
| 55         | 1068            | 1063             | 1069                  | 1061             | 1063                 | 1060 |
| 54         | 1060            | 1059             | 1061                  | 1060             | 1059                 | 1056 |
| 53         | 1056            | 1058             | 1052                  | 1055             | 1054                 | 1054 |
| 52         | 1055            | 1056             | 1050                  | 1052             | 1050                 | 1051 |
| 51         | 1053            | 1054             | 1049                  | 1051             | 1048                 | 1044 |
| 50         | 1052            | 1051             | 1048                  | 1048             | 1045                 | 1043 |

## 8.2

## Freshman CLA Scores, 1st-49th Percentiles

| Percentile | Total CLA Score | Performance Task | Analytic Writing Task | Make-an-Argument | Critique-an-Argument | EAA  |
|------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------|
| 49         | 1051            | 1044             | 1044                  | 1047             | 1043                 | 1038 |
| 48         | 1046            | 1042             | 1041                  | 1045             | 1039                 | 1036 |
| 47         | 1043            | 1040             | 1039                  | 1044             | 1038                 | 1033 |
| 46         | 1042            | 1038             | 1037                  | 1043             | 1034                 | 1032 |
| 45         | 1038            | 1037             | 1035                  | 1042             | 1029                 | 1030 |
| 44         | 1037            | 1034             | 1033                  | 1041             | 1028                 | 1028 |
| 43         | 1031            | 1033             | 1029                  | 1035             | 1022                 | 1025 |
| 42         | 1029            | 1029             | 1027                  | 1034             | 1019                 | 1021 |
| 41         | 1028            | 1027             | 1025                  | 1032             | 1016                 | 1020 |
| 40         | 1025            | 1022             | 1024                  | 1028             | 1014                 | 1017 |
| 39         | 1024            | 1016             | 1023                  | 1027             | 1012                 | 1016 |
| 38         | 1023            | 1014             | 1021                  | 1023             | 1010                 | 1012 |
| 37         | 1016            | 1012             | 1019                  | 1015             | 1009                 | 1010 |
| 36         | 1015            | 1008             | 1015                  | 1011             | 1008                 | 1005 |
| 35         | 1007            | 1006             | 1013                  | 1008             | 1007                 | 996  |
| 34         | 1005            | 999              | 1009                  | 1007             | 1004                 | 989  |
| 33         | 1000            | 998              | 1008                  | 1006             | 1001                 | 988  |
| 32         | 996             | 997              | 1003                  | 1004             | 998                  | 983  |
| 31         | 995             | 996              | 1001                  | 1002             | 996                  | 982  |
| 30         | 994             | 994              | 1000                  | 998              | 995                  | 981  |
| 29         | 993             | 993              | 999                   | 994              | 993                  | 976  |
| 28         | 992             | 992              | 995                   | 990              | 990                  | 974  |
| 27         | 990             | 991              | 989                   | 985              | 989                  | 971  |
| 26         | 987             | 983              | 988                   | 978              | 985                  | 970  |
| 25         | 986             | 982              | 983                   | 973              | 983                  | 962  |
| 24         | 982             | 976              | 977                   | 970              | 981                  | 957  |
| 23         | 980             | 972              | 976                   | 969              | 979                  | 956  |
| 22         | 977             | 970              | 974                   | 965              | 976                  | 955  |
| 21         | 975             | 968              | 972                   | 963              | 974                  | 952  |
| 20         | 970             | 966              | 963                   | 958              | 971                  | 950  |
| 19         | 963             | 959              | 961                   | 950              | 969                  | 946  |
| 18         | 955             | 955              | 956                   | 949              | 965                  | 944  |
| 17         | 954             | 949              | 949                   | 948              | 958                  | 940  |
| 16         | 946             | 947              | 948                   | 941              | 956                  | 934  |
| 15         | 941             | 944              | 944                   | 939              | 949                  | 931  |
| 14         | 937             | 933              | 943                   | 928              | 945                  | 917  |
| 13         | 936             | 931              | 939                   | 926              | 939                  | 908  |
| 12         | 933             | 929              | 938                   | 923              | 931                  | 904  |
| 11         | 932             | 924              | 935                   | 922              | 930                  | 896  |
| 10         | 918             | 912              | 931                   | 915              | 925                  | 894  |
| 9          | 916             | 903              | 927                   | 913              | 922                  | 887  |
| 8          | 913             | 899              | 924                   | 905              | 919                  | 877  |
| 7          | 899             | 894              | 917                   | 898              | 917                  | 867  |
| 6          | 896             | 889              | 904                   | 890              | 914                  | 865  |
| 5          | 884             | 879              | 897                   | 877              | 880                  | 860  |
| 4          | 873             | 873              | 883                   | 868              | 870                  | 851  |
| 3          | 858             | 862              | 853                   | 852              | 844                  | 839  |
| 2          | 838             | 841              | 770                   | 743              | 787                  | 745  |
| 1          | 756             | 759              | 753                   | 728              | 777                  | 735  |

### Carnegie Classification

Table 9.1 shows CLA schools grouped by Basic Carnegie Classification. The spread of schools corresponds fairly well with that of the 1,587 four-year, not-for-profit institutions across the nation.

Table 9.1 counts exclude some institutions that do not fall into these categories, such as Special Focus Institutions and institutions based outside of the United States.

### 9.1 Carnegie Classification of Institutional Sample

| Carnegie Classification            | Nation (n = 1,587) |            | CLA (n = 188) |            |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------|---------------|------------|
|                                    | Number             | Percentage | Number        | Percentage |
| Doctorate-granting Universities    | 275                | 17         | 27            | 14         |
| Master's Colleges and Universities | 619                | 39         | 95            | 51         |
| Baccalaureate Colleges             | 693                | 44         | 66            | 35         |

Source: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, *Carnegie Classifications Data File*, February 17, 2010.

School Characteristics

Table 9.2 provides comparative statistics on some important characteristics of colleges and universities across the nation with those of the CLA schools, and suggests that these CLA schools are fairly representative of four-year, not-for-profit institutions nationally. Percentage public is one exception.

9.2 School Characteristics of Institutional Sample

| School Characteristic                                       | Nation   | CLA      |
|---|----------|----------|
| Percentage public   | 32       | 50       |
| Percentage Historically Black College or University (HBCU)  | 5        | 6        |
| Mean percentage of undergraduates receiving Pell grants     | 31       | 30       |
| Mean six-year graduation rate                               | 51       | 51       |
| Mean Barron's selectivity rating                            | 3.6      | 3.3      |
| Mean estimated median SAT score                             | 1058     | 1041     |
| Mean number of FTE undergraduate students (rounded)         | 3,869    | 6,211    |
| Mean student-related expenditures per FTE student (rounded) | \$12,330 | \$10,851 |

*Source: College Results Online 2008 dataset, managed by and obtained with permission from the Education Trust, covers most 4-year Title IV-eligible higher-education institutions in the United States. Data were 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.*

### Sample Representativeness

---

CLA-participating students appeared to be generally representative of their classmates with respect to entering ability levels as measured by Entering Academic Ability (EAA) scores.

Specifically, across institutions, the average EAA score of CLA freshmen (as verified by the registrar) was only 9 points higher than that of the entire freshman class\*: 1047 versus 1038 ( $n = 182$  institutions). Further, the correlation between the average EAA score of CLA freshmen and their classmates was extremely high ( $r = .93$ ,  $n = 182$  institutions).

These data suggest that as a group, CLA freshmen were similar to all freshmen at participating institutions. This correspondence increases confidence in the inferences that can be made from the results with the samples of students that were tested at an institution to all the students at that institution.

\* As reported by 182 institution registrars in response to a fall 2010 request for information.

## School List

---

The institutions listed here in alphabetical order agreed to be identified as participating schools and may or may not have been included in comparative analyses.

### CLA Schools

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Alaska Pacific University                                | Cedar Crest College                               | Keene State College                    |
| Allegheny College  | Central Connecticut State University              | Kent State University                  |
| Appalachian State University                             | Champlain College                                 | LaGrange College                       |
| Augsburg College   | Charleston Southern University                    | Lane College                           |
| Aurora University  | Chatham University                                | Louisiana State University             |
| Averett University                                       | Clafin University                                 | Loyola University New Orleans          |
| Barton College   | Clarke University                                 | Lynchburg College                      |
| Bellarmino University                                    | College of Notre Dame of Maryland                 | Lynn University                        |
| Beloit College   | College of Saint Benedict / St. John's University | Macalester College                     |
| Benedictine University                                   | Colorado State University                         | Marian University                      |
| Bethel University  | Concord University                                | Marshall University                    |
| Bluefield State College                                  | Concordia College                                 | McMurry University                     |
| Burlington College                                       | Delaware State University                         | Messiah College                        |
| Cabrini College  | Dillard University                                | Miami University - Oxford              |
| California Baptist University                            | Dominican University                              | Minneapolis College of Art and Design  |
| California Maritime Academy                              | Drake University                                  | Minot State University                 |
| California State Polytechnic University, Pomona          | Eckerd College                                    | Misericordia University                |
| California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo | Emory & Henry College                             | Morgan State University                |
| California State University, Bakersfield                 | Emporia State University                          | Morningside College                    |
| California State University, Channel Islands             | Fairmont State University                         | Mount Saint Mary College               |
| California State University, Chico                       | Fort Hays State University                        | Mount St. Mary's College               |
| California State University, Dominguez Hills             | Franklin Pierce University                        | Nebraska Wesleyan University           |
| California State University, East Bay                    | Georgia College & State University                | Nicholls State University              |
| California State University, Fresno                      | Georgia State University                          | Northwestern State University          |
| California State University, Fullerton                   | Glenville State College                           | Our Lady of the Lake University        |
| California State University, Long Beach                  | Gordon College                                    | Peace College                          |
| California State University, Los Angeles                 | Hardin-Simmons University                         | Pittsburg State University             |
| California State University, Monterey Bay                | Hastings College                                  | Presbyterian College                   |
| California State University, Northridge                  | Hilbert College                                   | Randolph-Macon College                 |
| California State University, Sacramento                  | Hope College                                      | Richard Stockton College of New Jersey |
| California State University, San Bernardino              | Humboldt State University                         | Robert Morris University               |
| California State University, San Marcos                  | Illinois College                                  | Rockford College                       |
| California State University, Stanislaus                  | Indiana University of Pennsylvania                | Rutgers University-New Brunswick       |
| Carlow University  | Indiana Wesleyan University                       | Saginaw Valley State University        |
|  | Jackson State University                          | Saint Paul's College                   |
|  | Jacksonville State University                     | Saint Xavier University                |
|  | Jamestown College                                 | San Diego State University             |
|  | Juniata College                                   | San Francisco State University         |
|  |   | San Jose State University              |

**CLA Schools (continued)**

Seton Hill University  
 Shepherd University  
 Slippery Rock University  
 Sonoma State University  
 Southern Connecticut State University  
 Southern Oregon University  
 Southern Virginia University  
 Southwestern University  
 Springfield College  
 Stephens College  
 Stonehill College  
 SUNY College at Brockport  
 SUNY College at Buffalo  
 SUNY College at Cortland  
 SUNY College at Purchase  
 Tarleton State University  
 Texas Lutheran University  
 Texas Southern University  
 Texas State University San Marcos  
 The Citadel  
 The College of Idaho  
 The College of St. Scholastica  
 The University of Kansas  
 The University of Toledo  
 Towson University  
 Trinity Christian College  
 Truman State University  
 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville  
 University of Bridgeport  
 University of Charleston  
 University of Colorado, Boulder  
 University of Evansville  
 University of Findlay  
 University of Georgia  
 University of Great Falls  
 University of Mary Hardin-Baylor  
 University of Missouri - St. Louis  
 University of New Mexico  
 University of North Carolina at Asheville  
 University of North Carolina Pembroke  
 University of Pittsburgh  
 University of Southern California  
 University of St. Thomas (TX)  
 University of Texas - Pan American  
 University of Texas at Arlington  
 University of Texas at Austin  
 University of Texas at Dallas

University of Texas at El Paso  
 University of Texas at San Antonio  
 University of Texas at Tyler  
 University of Texas of the Permian Basin  
 University of West Georgia  
 University of Wisconsin La Crosse  
 Upper Iowa University  
 Ursinus College  
 Ursuline College  
 Wagner College  
 Warner University  
 Washington and Jefferson College  
 Wesley College  
 West Chester University  
 West Liberty University  
 West Virginia State University  
 West Virginia University  
 West Virginia University Institute of  
 Technology  
 Western Michigan University  
 Western New Mexico University  
 Westminster College (MO)  
 Westminster College (UT)  
 Westmont College  
 Wheaton College  
 Wichita State University  
 Willamette University  
 William Paterson University  
 William Woods University  
 Winston-Salem State University  
 Wisconsin Lutheran College  
 Wyoming Catholic College  
 Xavier University

**CCLA Schools**

Cecil College  
 Collin College  
 Colorado Mountain College  
 Dutchess Community College  
 Middlesex County College  
 Monroe Community College  
 Northern Marianas College  
 Palo Alto College  
 Yakima Valley Community College

**CWRA Schools**

A&M Consolidated High School  
 Akins High School  
 American Canyon High School  
 Anson New Tech High School  
 Asheville School  
 Brimmer & May School  
 Colorado Academy  
 Crystal Springs Uplands School  
 Currey Ingram Academy  
 Eagle Rock School  
 Eastern University Academy Charter School  
 Friends School of Baltimore  
 Gilmour Academy  
 Heritage Hall  
 Hillside New Tech High School  
 Ke Kula O Samuel M Kamakau  
 Kimball Union Academy  
 Lake Forest Academy  
 Metairie Park Country Day School  
 Mid-Pacific Institute  
 Moses Brown School  
 Nanakuli High and Intermediate School  
 Napa High School  
 Napa New Tech High School  
 Parish Episcopal School  
 Ramsey High School  
 Riverdale Country School  
 School of IDEAS  
 Severn School  
 Sonoma Academy  
 St. Andrew's School  
 St. George's Independent School  
 St. Gregory College Preparatory School  
 St. Luke's School  
 Stevenson School  
 Tech Valley High School  
 The Hotchkiss School  
 The Lawrenceville School  
 Tilton School  
 Trinity School of Midland  
 Upper Arlington School District  
 Vintage High School  
 Waianae High School  
 Warren New Tech High School  
 Warwick Valley High School  
 Watershed School  
 Wildwood School

In tandem with your report, we provide a CLA Student Data File, which includes variables across three categories: self-reported information from students in their CLA online profile; CLA scores and identifiers; and information provided by the registrar.

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 factors related to 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. In addition, correlations between individual CLA scores and other measures would be attenuated due to unreliability.

### Self-Reported Data

- Name (first, middle initial, last)
- Student ID
- E-mail address
- Date of birth
- Gender
- Race/Ethnicity
- Parent Education
- Primary and Secondary Academic Major (36 categories)
- Field of Study (6 categories; based on primary academic major)
- English as primary language
- Attended school as freshman, sophomore, junior, senior
- Local survey responses

### CLA Scores and Identifiers

- For Performance Task, Analytic Writing Task, Make-an-Argument, and Critique-an-Argument (depending on the tasks taken and completeness of responses):
  - CLA scores
  - Performance Level categories (i.e., well below expected, below expected, near expected, above expected, well above expected)\*
  - Percentile Rank across schools and within your school (among students in the same class year, based on score)
- Subscores in Analytic Reasoning and Evaluation, Writing Effectiveness, Writing Mechanics, and Problem Solving
- SLE score (if applicable, 1-50)
- Entering Academic Ability (EAA) score
- Unique CLA numeric identifiers
- Year, Test window (Fall or Spring), Date of test, and Time spent on test

### Registrar Data

- Class Standing
- Transfer Student Status
- Program Code and Name (for classification of students into different colleges, schools, fields of study, programs, etc., if applicable)
- SAT Total (Math + Verbal)
- SAT I Math
- SAT I Verbal / Critical Reading
- SAT I Writing
- ACT Composite
- GPA (not applicable for entering students)

\* The residuals that inform these levels are from an OLS regression of CLA scores on EAA scores, across all schools. Roughly 20% of students (within class) fall into each performance level.

As a next step forward, we encourage institutions to communicate their CLA results with various campus constituencies. Additional recommended steps include linking student-level CLA results with other data sources, staying engaged and informed through the CLA Spotlight series, and participating in CLA Education offerings.

Student-level CLA results are provided for you to link to other data sources (e.g., course-taking patterns, grades, portfolios, student satisfaction and engagement surveys, content-specific tests, etc.). These internal analyses can help you generate hypotheses for additional research, which you can pursue through CLA in-depth sampling (e.g., of programs or colleges within your campus) in subsequent years or simultaneously.

We welcome your participation in the CLA Spotlight—a series of free informational web conferences. Each

CLA Spotlight features campuses doing promising work using the CLA, guest-speakers from the larger world of assessment, or CLA staff members who provide updates or insights to CLA-related programs and projects.

We also encourage you to find ways to align teaching, learning, and assessment efforts at your institution. One way to do that is to participate in the programming of CLA Education, which complements CLA Assessment. CLA Education focuses on curriculum and pedagogy, and embraces the crucial role that faculty can play in connecting classroom practice and institution-wide assessment.

The flagship program of CLA Education is the Performance Task Academy series, which shifts the focus from general assessment to the course-level work of faculty members. This series of hands-on training workshops provides opportunities for faculty members to receive guidance

in creating their own performance tasks, building rubrics, and developing pedagogical practices to encourage the development of higher-order skills. For more information, visit [www.claintheclassroom.org](http://www.claintheclassroom.org).

Through the steps noted above we encourage institutions to move toward a continuous system of improvement stimulated by the CLA. Without your contributions, the CLA would not be on the exciting path that it is today. We look forward to your continued involvement!

Roger Benjamin  
*President & CEO, Council for Aid to Education*

James Hundley  
*Executive Vice President & COO, Council for Aid to Education*

Richard Atkinson  
*President Emeritus, University of California System*

Doug Bennett  
*President, Earlham College*

Michael Crow  
*President, Arizona State University*

Russell C. Deyo  
*Vice President & General Counsel, Johnson & Johnson*

Richard Foster  
*Managing Partner, Millbrook Management Group, LLC*

Ronald Gidwitz  
*Chairman, GCG Partners*

Lewis Kaden  
*Vice Chairman, Citigroup Inc.*

Michael Lomax  
*President, United Negro College Fund*

Katharine Lyall  
*President Emeritus, University of Wisconsin System*

Eduardo Marti  
*Vice Chancellor for Community Colleges, CUNY*

Ronald Mason  
*President, Southern University System*

Diana Natalicio  
*President, The University of Texas at El Paso*

Charles Reed  
*Chancellor, California State University*

Michael D. Rich  
*Executive Vice President, RAND Corporation*

Benno Schmidt  
*Chairman, Leeds Global Partners, LLC*

Farris Womack  
*Executive Vice President & CFO, Emeritus; Professor, Emeritus, The University of Michigan*

# 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](mailto:cla@cae.org) w | [www.cae.org/cla](http://www.cae.org/cla)