

**Conference Call – MVASL Leadership Committee
December 12, 2005
Summary Notes**

Participants:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---|
| • Mike Easter | Mineral Area College |
| • Charles Van Middlesworth | Metropolitan Community Colleges |
| • Mike Grelle | Central Missouri State University |
| • Sue Pieper | Truman State University |
| • Kathy Marlock | Webster University |
| • Cathryn Pridal | Westminster College |
| • Robert Stein | Missouri Department of Higher Education |
| • Jeremy Kintzel | Missouri Department of Higher Education |

Consensus Items:

- CAE should be encouraged to move beyond reporting for accountability to supporting improvement
- CLA should fit within the context of Higher Learning Commission requirements
- CLA should fit within a multi-layered assessment program

Action Items:

- Invite small CAE team (including Roger Benjamin) to Missouri for discussion in early 2006
- Develop standardized report template

For Further Discussion With CAE:

- definitions / benchmarks
 - use of labels, e.g. exiting students vs. seniors
 - “entering / exiting” student definitions, e.g. treatment of college credit earned in high school or hours completed by exiting students
 - establishment of minimal standards
 - criteria for acceptable comparative benchmarks
 - explicit descriptions re scoring rubrics and scoring procedure
 - list all participating institutions
- institutional buy-in issues
 - more advanced notice re web conferences
 - turnaround time for reports
 - train some faculty to be CLA scorers / test item developers
 - cost structures
 - flexibility in testing times, frequency and use of results
 - potential sample bias
 - provide more recent studies on reliability / validity of CLA
 - issues in institutional comparisons regarding magnitude of scale and/or varied results in constructing stratified random sample

- provide actual student work to campuses who wish to review and discuss student performance
- standardized report template
 - improve graphing to better contextualize institutional comparisons (i.e. unique institutional or sector symbols)
 - report participant survey data to institutions (i.e. respondent characteristics, major data, and motivation data) and make individual student survey results available to institutions
 - present more institutional data in tables as well as (or in addition to) graphs
 - provide current institutional reports as appendices to more broadly understandable executive summary
 - include information in graphs on exiting two-year students
 - provide student results spreadsheet and get rid of password protection
 - provide information on strategies for how to use CLA results (institutional examples, etc.)
 - suggest strategies for presenting results to various audiences