

CLAS

FALL 2012 CLA OVERVIEW

Your Fall 2012 results consist of three components:

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

Overview

This Fall 2012 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 2012 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 2012 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.

Assessing Higher-Order Skills

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 the teaching and learning process.

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 deemed 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.

CLA Methodology

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 test administration reflect the performance of your entering students.

Your institution's interim 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 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.

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

Only 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.

An Introduction to the CLA Tasks

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 solve 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. A question and a response box are on the left side of the screen. 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, then analyze and organize

them on multiple dimensions, and ultimately 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 to evaluate, in 30 minutes, 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.

Example Document Library

Your Document Library contains the following materials.

- Newspaper article about the accident
- Federal Accident Report on in-flight breakups in single-engine planes
- Internal correspondence (Pat's email to you and Sally's email 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 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% 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.

Interpreting CLA Results

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 across task and subscore categories 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"> Asserts an insightful position and provides multiple (at least four) sound reasons to justify it. 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it very easy to follow the writer's argument. Provides valid and comprehensive elaboration on each reason for the writer's position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States a thoughtful position and provides multiple (at least three) sound reasons to support it. 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a logically cohesive way that makes it fairly easy to follow the writer's argument. Provides valid elaboration on each reason for the writer's position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States a clear position and some (two or three) sound reasons to support it. Provides some careful analysis, but it lacks consideration of the issue's complexity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organizes response in a way that makes the writer's argument and its logic apparent but not obvious. Provides valid elaboration on reasons for the writer's position several times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States or implies a position and provides few (one or two) reasons to support it. Provides some superficial analysis of the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a limited or somewhat unclear argument. Presents relevant information, but that information is not woven into an argument. Provides valid elaboration on reasons for the writer's position a few times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States or implies a position and provides vague or very few reasons to support it. Provides little analysis, and that analysis may reflect an oversimplification of the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides limited, invalid, overstated, or very unclear argument. May present information in a disorganized fashion or undermine own points. 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States an unclear position (if any) and fails to provide reasons to support it. Provides very little evidence of analysis. May not understand the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to develop a convincing argument. The writing may be disorganized and confusing. Fails to provide elaboration on reasons for the writer's position. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.

	Analytic Reasoning & Evaluation	Writing Effectiveness	Writing Mechanics
6	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate understanding of the complete argument. • Identifies many (at least five) deficiencies in the argument and provides analysis that goes beyond the obvious. 	<p>Constructing organized and logically cohesive arguments. Strengthening the writer's position by elaborating on deficiencies in the argument (e.g., providing explanations and examples).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>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).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate understanding of much of the argument. • Identifies many (at least four) deficiencies in the argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate understanding of several aspects of the argument, but disregards a few. • Identifies several (at least three) deficiencies in the argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disregards several aspects of the argument or makes minor misinterpretations of the argument. • Identifies a few (two or three) deficiencies in the argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disregards or misinterprets much of the information in the argument. • Identifies very few (one or two) deficiencies in the argument and may accept unreliable evidence as credible. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disregards or severely misinterprets important information in the argument. • Fails to identify deficiencies in the argument or provides no evidence of critical analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Scoring CLA Responses

The CLA uses a combination of automated and human scoring, relying 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. To ensure continuous human scorer calibration, CAE developed the E-Verification system for the online Scoring Interface. The E-Verification system was developed to improve and streamline scoring. Calibration of scorers through the E-Verification system requires scorers to score previously-scored results or “Verification Papers”^{*} when they first start scoring, as well as throughout the scoring window. The system will periodically present Verification Papers to scorers, though the scorers are not alerted to the Verification Papers. The system does not indicate when a scorer has successfully scored a Verification Paper, but if the scorer fails to accurately score a series of Verification Papers, he or she will be removed from scoring and must participate in a remediation process.

At this point, 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.

^{*} The Verification Papers were drawn from responses collected during the 2010-2011 administration that were scored by both human scorers and the automated scoring engine. Each Verification Paper and its scores were reviewed by a lead scorer prior to being designated as a Verification Paper.

Scaling EAA Scores

To facilitate reporting results across schools, ACT scores are 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 measure of cognitive ability, as part of the CLA. The SLE is produced by Wonderlic, Inc. SLE scores are 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 www.act.org/aap/concordance/pdf/report.pdf

Converting Scores to a Common Scale

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 score 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 + Critical Reading) 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, responses since fall 2010 have tended 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	1288	1300	1275	1272	1272	1444
98	1258	1285	1228	1231	1234	1288
97	1237	1275	1220	1230	1222	1285
96	1217	1233	1204	1201	1211	1250
95	1203	1202	1200	1196	1206	1241
94	1202	1201	1193	1193	1205	1238
93	1193	1196	1192	1189	1195	1216
92	1191	1191	1191	1184	1190	1203
91	1186	1190	1188	1183	1185	1198
90	1173	1175	1169	1175	1176	1184
89	1161	1159	1163	1165	1167	1169
88	1160	1158	1159	1162	1164	1166
87	1154	1156	1154	1159	1163	1155
86	1153	1154	1153	1157	1161	1154
85	1152	1150	1149	1156	1157	1146
84	1150	1146	1144	1149	1148	1144
83	1146	1144	1142	1146	1147	1138
82	1141	1142	1141	1142	1144	1136
81	1133	1132	1140	1138	1142	1130
80	1132	1126	1139	1136	1141	1127
79	1129	1124	1133	1131	1134	1122
78	1126	1123	1131	1123	1129	1121
77	1124	1122	1124	1121	1127	1116
76	1120	1115	1120	1117	1121	1114
75	1116	1113	1119	1115	1120	1112
74	1115	1111	1114	1113	1109	1110
73	1107	1108	1110	1112	1108	1107
72	1103	1102	1110	1111	1107	1105
71	1099	1096	1109	1110	1104	1104
70	1094	1091	1106	1109	1099	1097
69	1093	1090	1105	1108	1098	1096
68	1092	1089	1104	1106	1094	1094
67	1091	1087	1102	1105	1093	1090
66	1090	1086	1101	1105	1090	1086
65	1088	1085	1098	1104	1088	1083
64	1086	1083	1097	1102	1087	1082
63	1082	1080	1092	1096	1085	1081
62	1082	1077	1091	1094	1084	1077
61	1081	1074	1090	1093	1083	1075
60	1080	1071	1085	1092	1082	1064
59	1078	1069	1084	1088	1081	1060
58	1075	1068	1081	1085	1080	1056
57	1073	1066	1079	1075	1079	1053
56	1067	1063	1078	1074	1077	1048
55	1067	1061	1077	1072	1075	1047
54	1066	1058	1074	1069	1074	1041
53	1065	1057	1072	1068	1073	1040
52	1064	1056	1069	1066	1068	1037
51	1060	1055	1067	1066	1066	1036
50	1059	1053	1066	1065	1060	1032

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	1058	1052	1065	1064	1058	1028
48	1052	1050	1064	1059	1055	1021
47	1050	1043	1060	1056	1053	1017
46	1044	1042	1057	1053	1052	1016
45	1044	1041	1054	1051	1051	1016
44	1043	1039	1050	1050	1048	1015
43	1043	1037	1048	1049	1047	1010
42	1042	1035	1046	1046	1045	1009
41	1038	1032	1040	1045	1040	1008
40	1033	1030	1033	1039	1031	1006
39	1032	1028	1031	1037	1030	1005
38	1027	1023	1031	1036	1024	1003
37	1025	1021	1030	1034	1020	1002
36	1024	1020	1025	1033	1016	997
35	1022	1017	1023	1030	1015	993
34	1019	1016	1022	1028	1010	987
33	1018	1012	1021	1026	1009	986
32	1016	1007	1015	1015	1005	981
31	1012	1004	1013	1014	999	980
30	1009	1000	1011	1013	998	978
29	1003	999	1009	1012	997	977
28	1000	998	1003	1011	996	975
27	994	995	1002	1010	993	974
26	989	991	997	1008	988	964
25	985	987	996	1006	985	962
24	984	978	995	1004	982	961
23	982	975	992	1000	978	958
22	980	973	990	999	977	957
21	978	970	987	994	975	953
20	974	969	986	991	974	951
19	970	966	983	989	968	947
18	967	959	975	984	966	932
17	965	956	974	978	962	931
16	964	952	973	967	958	924
15	956	944	969	959	954	914
14	953	943	961	950	953	911
13	951	941	951	945	951	909
12	949	933	946	942	947	907
11	943	928	944	940	943	905
10	938	926	940	931	937	903
9	930	922	934	920	936	902
8	921	915	931	910	929	891
7	919	904	924	904	926	880
6	917	897	923	903	925	863
5	908	876	920	900	920	855
4	900	844	905	896	904	834
3	884	841	895	886	896	833
2	845	831	846	840	836	793
1	806	792	823	793	815	718

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 = 150)	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Doctorate-granting Universities	275	17	21	14
Master's Colleges and Universities	619	39	78	52
Baccalaureate Colleges	693	44	51	34

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

School Characteristics

Table 9.2 provides statistics on some important characteristics of colleges and universities across the nation compared with CLA schools. These statistics suggest 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	55
Percentage Historically Black College or University (HBCU)	5	4
Mean percentage of undergraduates receiving Pell grants	31	30
Mean six-year graduation rate	51	51
Mean Barron's selectivity rating	3.6	3.1
Mean estimated median SAT score	1058	1034
Mean number of FTE undergraduate students (rounded)	3,869	6,643
Mean student-related expenditures per FTE student (rounded)	\$12,330	\$10,867

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 2 points higher than that of the entire freshman class*: 1049 versus 1047 ($n = 136$ institutions). Further, the correlation between the average EAA score of CLA freshmen and their classmates was extremely high ($r = .94$, $n = 136$ 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 136 institution registrars in response to a fall 2012 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	CUNY - College of Staten Island	McPherson College
Albion College	CUNY - Hunter College	Mercer University
Amherst College	CUNY - John Jay College of Criminal Justice	Misericordia University
Ashland University	CUNY - Lehman College	Morgan State University
Augsburg College	CUNY - New York City College of Technology	Newman University
Augustana College	CUNY - Queens College	Northern Illinois University
Barton College	CUNY - The City College of New York	Ouachita Baptist University
Bellarmino University	CUNY - York College	Our Lady of the Lake University
Beloit College	Dillard University	Pacific Lutheran University
Bluefield State College	Eckerd College	Pittsburg State university
Bowling Green State University	Elizabethtown College	Presbyterian College
Bradley University	Emory & Henry College	Queen's University, Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science
Brigham Young University - Idaho	Emporia State University	Quest University
Buena Vista University	Fairmont State University	Randolph-Macon College
Buffalo State College - SUNY	Fayetteville State University	Robert Morris University
California Maritime Academy	Flagler College	Rockford College
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	Florida International University Honors College	Saginaw Valley State University
California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo	Fort Hays State University	Saint Joseph's College
California State University, Bakersfield	Georgia College & State University	Saint Xavier University
California State University, Channel Islands	Gordon College	San Diego State University
California State University, Chico	Grand Canyon University	San Francisco State University
California State University, Dominguez Hills	Hardin-Simmons University	San Jose State University
California State University, East Bay	Hastings College	Seton Hill University
California State University, Fresno	Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning	Shepherd University
California State University, Fullerton	Humboldt State University	Sheridan College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning, Four-Year Bachelor's Degree Programs
California State University, Long Beach	Illinois College	Slippery Rock University
California State University, Los Angeles	Indiana University of Pennsylvania	Sonoma State University
California State University, Monterey Bay	Indiana Wesleyan University (Dept. of Psychology)	Southern Oregon University
California State University, Northridge	Jacksonville State University	Southwestern University
California State University, Sacramento	Jamestown College	St. Olaf College
California State University, San Bernardino	Johnson & Wales University	Sul Ross State University
California State University, San Marcos	Kalamazoo College	SUNY College of Technology at Canton
California State University, Stanislaus	Kent State University	Texas A&M Kingsville
Centenary College	King's College	Texas State University - San Marcos
Centenary College of Louisiana	LaGrange College	The Citadel
Central Michigan University	Loyola University of New Orleans	The College of Idaho
Chatham University	Lynchburg College	The College of St. Scholastica
Clarke University	Lynn University	The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
College of Saint Benedict/St. John's University	Marshall University	The Sage Colleges
Colorado State University	McMaster University & Mohawk College, Medical Radiation Sciences Program	Transylvania University
Concord University	McMaster University, Faculty of Social Sciences	Truman State University
CUNY - Baruch College	McMurry University	University of Bridgeport
CUNY - Brooklyn College		University of Evansville
		University of Great Falls
		University of Guelph, Bachelor of Arts, Honours & Bachelor of Science, Honours

CLA Schools (continued)

University of Hartford
 University of Hawaii at Hilo College of
 Business and Economics
 University of Houston-Downtown
 University of Missouri - St. Louis
 University of Ottawa
 University of Pittsburgh
 University of Saint Mary
 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 the Virgin Islands
 University of Toledo
 University of Vermont
 University of Windsor, Faculties of Nursing,
 Arts & Social Science, and Engineering
 Upper Iowa University
 Ursuline College
 Weber State University
 West Liberty University
 West Virginia University
 West Virginia University Institute of
 Technology
 Western Governors University
 Western Washington University
 Westminster College (MO)
 Westminster College (UT)
 Wichita State University
 Wichita State University (School of
 Engineering)
 William Peace University
 Winston-Salem State University
 Wisconsin Lutheran College
 Wyoming Catholic College

CCLA Schools

Cecil College
 Collin College
 Colorado Mountain College
 CUNY - Borough of Manhattan
 Community College
 CUNY - Bronx Community College
 CUNY - Hostos Community College
 CUNY - Kingsborough Community
 College

CUNY - LaGuardia Community College
 CUNY - Medgar Evers College
 CUNY - Queensborough Community
 College
 Fanshawe College of Applied Arts and
 Technology, Health Science Program
 Howard Community College
 Midland College

CWRA Schools

Abington Friends School
 Akins High School
 Albemarle High School
 All Saints Academy
 Anson New Tech High School
 Asheville School
 Barrie School
 Bosque School
 Brimmer and May School
 Brooks School
 Catalina Foothills High School
 Collegiate School
 Colorado Academy
 Colorado Rocky Mountain School
 Crystal Springs Uplands School
 Culver Academies
 Currey Ingram Academy
 Eagle Rock School
 Friends School of Baltimore
 Gilmour Academy
 Graettinger-Terril High School
 Greensboro Day School
 Hebron Academy
 Heritage Hall
 Hillside New Tech High School
 Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy
 Jefferson Forest High School
 Ke Kula O Samuel M Kamakau
 Kimball Union Academy
 Kirtland High School
 Lake Forest Academy
 Lakeview Academy
 Le Jardin Academy
 Los Angeles School of Global Studies
 Maryknoll School
 Math, Engineering, Technology, and Science
 Academy
 McKinley Academy
 Mead High School
 Menlo School
 Metairie Park Country Day School
 Mid-Pacific Institute
 Millennium Brooklyn High School
 Monticello High School

Moorestown Friends School
 Moses Brown School
 Mount Vernon Presbyterian School
 Mt. Spokane High School
 Murray High School
 Nanakuli High and Intermediate School
 Napa New Tech High School
 New Tech at Ruston
 Newell-Fonda High School
 Parish Episcopal School
 Ramsey High School
 Reading Memorial High School
 Regional School Unit 13
 Rising Tide Charter School
 Riverpoint Academy
 Sacramento New Tech High School
 Sacred Hearts Academy
 Salem Academy
 Sandia Preparatory School
 School of IDEAS
 Severn School
 Sonoma Academy
 Spirit Lake High School
 St. Andrew's School
 St. Christopher's School
 St. George's Independent School
 St. Gregory College Preparatory School
 St. Luke's School
 St. Margaret's Episcopal School
 St. Mark's School
 Staunton River High School
 Stevenson School
 Stuart Country Day School
 Tech Valley High School
 Tesseract School
 The Bishop Strachan School
 The Chapin School
 The Haverford School
 The Hotchkiss School
 The Hun School of Princeton
 The Lawrenceville School
 The Lovett School
 The Taft School
 The Webb School
 Tilton School
 Trinity School of Midland
 Upper Arlington High School
 Wardlaw-Hartridge School
 Warren New Tech High School
 Warwick Valley High School
 Watershed School
 Western Albemarle High School
 Westtown School
 Wildwood School
 York 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
- Email 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, if applicable

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, Testing 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 + Critical Reading)
- SAT I Math
- SAT I Critical Reading (Verbal)
- 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.

Using the CLA to Improve Institutional Performance

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 CLA web conferences, 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 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 collegiatelearningassessment.org/pta.

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 Emeritus, 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

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, University of Texas at El Paso

Charles Reed

Chancellor, California State University

Michael D. Rich

President & CEO, 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 16 new york new york 10016-6023
p | 212.217.0700 f | 212.661.9766 e | cla@cae.org w | www.cae.org/cla