Objectives, Team Members, and Outcomes ~ Our value-added assessment project has already begun to engage, energize, and (will ultimately) transform our institutions. We originally proposed to create and nurture friendly intra- and inter-campus environments for assessment, collect “stories and data” to demonstrate the value-added of a liberal arts education while articulating and strengthening each institution’s unique approach to the liberal arts, and, in so doing, breathe new life into what we already do well. Our collaborative efforts – through tireless leadership (of Paul Kuerbis and Larry Stimpert at Colorado College, Bob Southard at Earlham College, and Anne Dueweke and Paul Sotherland at Kalamazoo College) and enthusiastic participation of many colleagues (faculty, administration, and staff) at all three institutions – have put the generous support of the Teagle Foundation to good use (please see Budget Report – Appendix 1), have yielded many benefits (some unanticipated), and have established significant positive momentum that will carry this project, and outgrowths from it, well into the future. Expressing sentiments shared by members of our collaborative, Dr. Eileen Wilson-Oyelaran, President of Kalamazoo College, recently wrote, “We believe that colleges and universities should demonstrate their effectiveness through a scholarly examination of the impact of their educational programs on students. Faculty and administrators are accustomed to scholarly endeavors in which they must provide supporting evidence for assertions made; we should expect to do no less when making claims about degrees to which students become better educated through our curricula.” We have begun combining nationally-normed instruments (the NSSE, to measure active involvement of students in their own education, and the CLA, to measure changes that occur between matriculation and graduation in students’ ability to think, reason, and write) with qualitative and quantitative evaluations designed by each of our institutions to gauge the influence of our unique curricular features and provide verifiable evidence of the value of a liberal arts education. Yes, we are slowly but surely becoming the “communitarian Mill” to which Bob Connor alluded (LiberalArtsOnline, June 2005).

Accomplishments in 2005-2006 Academic Year ~ We have built and fostered the social capital and trust needed for an effective collaborative, we are collecting data (directly or indirectly) through nationally-normed instruments (CIRP, NSSE, and CLA), and we are beginning to gather data and “stories” through our targeted assessment projects so as to attain the objectives of our project. Becoming better acquainted, while sharing and acquiring information about effects of a college education on students – through short get-to-know-you meetings last summer, our fall meeting at Colorado College, the Teagle/AAC&U meeting in February, and our spring meeting at Earlham College, as well as through the many meetings we have had with colleagues at our own institutions, has continued to play a huge role in the success of our collaborative. Hearing Bob Southard talk (at a 2004 AAC&U meeting) about the importance of spending funds on “food” and experiencing first-hand (at the 2004 Teagle Listening) how good accommodations and supportive atmosphere can engender stimulating conversations encouraged us to allocate time, careful attention, and resources to making sure that collaborators (including students) feel well treated. Doing so works! Campus visits (to Earlham and Colorado) by Paul Sotherland and Anne Dueweke last summer helped the “major players” at the three institutions get to know each other better and helped set the stage for work during the ensuing year. Through meetings of collaborative representatives in the fall (Colorado College - Appendix 2) and spring (Earlham College - Appendix 3) we learned more about characteristics of each institution, while charting our course and sharing what we were learning through our targeted assessments and from the CLA. Strengthening the good relationships we formed while writing our project proposal, along with what Bob Southard refers to as the “friend-raising” that has taken place within and among our institutions, has reinforced our original notions about
the power of collaborating. Having these good relationships has also fostered candid, yet supportive, conversations about what is working, and what is not, at our institutions.

We openly shared data collected by, and about, the three institutions via the CIRP, NSSE, and CLA, and by doing so learned more about each other and about ourselves. CIRP and NSSE data shared at the Colorado College meeting in the fall gave us a better sense of (many) similarities and (a few) differences among our colleges. Sharing these data again this fall (at Kalamazoo College) will deepen insights gained a year ago. The vast majority of our work this year was devoted to getting organized for, and then administering, the CLA. Describing what any one institution did (and we all did tons) to accomplish this feat would easily fill the balance of our allotted space (and then some) for this report. To provide some sense of what took place, we include (in Appendix 4) a communication plan and two of the many letters we sent out to CLA recruits and participants in the fall (incoming first-year students) and in the spring (graduating seniors). In the fall, 843 of our first-year students (CC-451, EC-170, KC-222) successfully took the CLA; we will receive details about our seniors by mid-July 2006. (Because of Colorado College’s huge success with recruiting students to take the CLA in the fall, CAE invited them to help with a pilot study of additional CLA essay questions in December.)

Writing so little about the Herculean task of getting from where we were one year ago to where we are now, with regard to the CLA, seems imprudent, so we will provide a few more details. Working with James Padilla (at CAE) – negotiating the way in which our collaborative administers the CLA for the duration of our project, helping us devise consent forms, keeping us on task, holding our hands as we learned about and then administered the CLA, keeping us apprised of how we were doing, and encouraging us along the way – was a pleasure. That said, we also became known at CAE as “The Teagle Three,” which we hope was a term of endearment (hah!). Expressing relief about being on this side of the CLA (for now) is probably an understatement, but, in retrospect, the entire process went fairly smoothly. Working through difficulties and successes – as a group – seemed much better than doing the same alone.

We are intrigued by data showing how our first-year students performed on the CLA, and look forward to receiving results from the seniors and making comparisons among the two data sets. CLA results for first-year students from all three institutions fell within (or near) the ellipse in the top panel of Appendix 5, and within the “expected” range of scores. And, CLA scores for individual students showed quite a bit of scatter (Appendix 5, bottom panel) at all three institutions as well. Knowing what to make of these data will be difficult until we get CLA results for graduating seniors from this year and from this year’s first-year students when they are seniors. We spent quite a bit of time during our spring meeting (at Earlham) talking about our results and about how we might feel in response to “scores” for our seniors moving (or not) relative to first-year scores. One observation we made while administering the CLA involved the use of scratch paper by students – only a very few of the first-year students used scratch paper to brainstorm, do calculations, or outline an argument whereas many of the seniors made frequent use of scratch paper while creating answers to questions posed on the CLA. The fall “data sharing” at Kalamazoo will be fascinating.

Our Targeted Assessment Projects (Appendix 6) will end up yielding useful and enlightening information about the importance of senior capstone projects, effectiveness of general education courses with helping students to learn writing and quantitative reasoning, and effects of study abroad and an internationalized curriculum on students’ intercultural understanding. All projects are in various early stages of implementation, but progress is being made on all fronts. After lengthy deliberation, Colorado College decided to focus on the senior capstone project, of interest there as well as at the other two institutions. Similarly, the project at Earlham focusing on writing and quantitative reasoning and the project at Kalamazoo on transformative effects of study abroad are of interest locally and generally in our collaborative. An unexpected, but very interesting, outcome of students interviewing students in the latter project was valuable insight into the importance of, and need for, structured reflection by students about their educational experiences. Many of us know from personal experience that having time to reflect on what has happened can help strengthen memories, deepen understanding, and create connections between various events. We learned (i.e. made the shift from assuming/imagining to knowing, from first-hand
experience) that providing the “reflectors” with an attentive “audience,” in one-on-one conversations is highly valued by both participants. Illustrative comments from students involved include: “I think the interview process had more of an effect on the interviewees and me than any of us expected;” “I think the interviewees also benefited from reflecting on and making connections within their experiences;” and “I connected on a pretty meaningful level with three people I’d never met before and whom I now have a good excuse to talk with – definitely good for community building!” We were hoping to get “stories and data” from these interviews to help us learn more about how our students become better educated; we obtained much more than we anticipated.

Challenges we faced ~ We will simply list many of these without additional elaboration. The CLA, developing greater intra-institutional support and trust (i.e. getting the entire campus on-board), and getting institutional approval for student incentives were all time-consuming and somewhat frustrating at times. However, we now feel somewhat adept at recruiting for and administering the CLA, and more colleagues are becoming interested in and involved with our project. Issues with student incentives at Kalamazoo College need to be solved locally with patience and persistence.

Successes we enjoyed ~ In addition to the many we already described, we add the following: students involved in the project feel good about their contributions; support for, and interest in, the project from faculty, administrators, and trustees is growing noticeably, and we are confident this will continue as results from our project begin appearing and are shared with colleagues. Comments like “You must be Teagling today,” when members of the project team are seen sitting together at lunch, and hearing more requests for “evidence” to support assertions made in meetings are sure signs that progress is being made.

Plans for Year Two ~ We anticipate accomplishing the following in the upcoming year: meet at Kalamazoo College for a “data sharing” on 29-30 September; give presentations about facets of our project at the AAC&U annual meeting; continue with our targeted assessment projects and then gather at Colorado College at the end of March for interim reports about those projects; play key roles in helping our institutions seriously consider results from the recent NSSE and CLA, celebrate successes, and then take requisite steps to resolve problems discovered; and continue to develop a “Teagle Three” website at Kalamazoo College to help disseminate results and lessons learned. By the time we meet in Kalamazoo at the end of September we will have received CLA results from our seniors and a report about differences between their performance and that of our first-year students, we should have results from the 2006 NSSE, and we will have learned more from our targeted assessment projects. We will focus much of our attention on sharing and discussing these data, and we will make plans for the AAC&U annual meeting, for which we will submit proposals by the 24 July deadline. We decided this year to postpone our “summer” data sharing until early fall so that would have new data (from the CLA and NSSE) to share. Doing so caused us to move the next Earlham meeting to after our spring meeting at Colorado. Depending on how our projects and meetings progress, we might consider moving the meeting at Earlham College to the fall of 2007 instead of early summer. We have plenty of resources to fund three meetings next year, but having only two meetings this year seemed to be sufficient (for now).

Tasks for this summer include preparing proposals for the AAC&U meeting in New Orleans, working on targeted assessment projects, planning for our fall meeting at Kalamazoo College, and adding to our website. For the AAC&U meeting we might consider giving a panel presentation on “Forming Effective Collaboratives,” doing a research session on a targeted assessment project, and/or presenting a case study on administering the CLA.

Clearly…support from the Teagle Foundation has catalyzed a vibrant collaboration among three intellectually voracious and positively restless colleges. Through his accusation, “There is little empirical justification for the conceit of influence embedded in the rhetoric of liberal learning and general education” (in Declining by Degrees), Leon Botstein posed a challenge to institutions of higher education. Our grant from the Teagle Foundation has undeniably catalyzed a refreshingly interrogative approach to various endeavors at our three institutions as we rise to meet Botstein’s challenge. We worked hard and enjoyed ourselves during the past year, and we look forward to an even more enlightening future.
Appendix One

Budget Report
Table 1 shows the original project budget for year one, including funds from the Teagle Foundation and each institution’s match.

Table 2 shows how we planned to allocate Teagle Foundation funds among the three institutions along with a few reallocation decisions we made early on. We decided to move $2,000 from Kalamazoo’s and Earlham’s targeted assessment lines in order to send additional colleagues to the first project meeting in Colorado. We also decided to move $370 from each institution’s targeted assessment line so that Paul Sotherland and Anne Dueweke could make preliminary visits to Earlham and Colorado in summer 2005 to meet the major players at each institution and make plans for the first project meeting in Colorado. These meetings turned out to be very valuable. Finally, we moved an additional $750 from Kalamazoo’s targeted assessment line to create a “Social Capital” fund to cover costs of communication with stakeholders, to hold faculty information sessions on the CLA, and to meet with colleagues over lunch.

Table 3 shows our actual expenditures. We saved money on the CLA because we were charged a flat rate instead of the per capita rate we had budgeted. We came close to spending our student incentive funds. We spent over what was budgeted for the project meetings at Colorado and Earlham, mainly because we had not anticipated fully “on the ground” expenses of the host institution and because we involved more colleagues than we had originally planned. However, we believe that we will not have to meet three times every year, so funds budgeted generally for project team meetings will be sufficient for our work. Kalamazoo spent about half of the funds allocated for targeted assessment, and Earlham spent close to its total allocation. Colorado has not yet expended funds in their targeted assessment line since they spent most of the year planning their project.

We have much more budget detail available for Kalamazoo’s expenditures. We can obtain more detail from Colorado and Earlham upon request. In hindsight, the reimbursement form (included after the Memorandum of Understanding) I created for Earlham and Colorado is not detailed enough. I plan to revise this form for year two. Please let me know if the foundation would prefer a more detailed budget report.

Table 4 shows how much each institution spent in matching funds for the project. We had originally imagined that representatives from each institution would attend the AAC&U Annual Meeting and that our institutions would cover the cost. We later decided that it was too soon to present on our project and attended the Teagle/AAC&U conference in lieu of the Annual Meeting. Colorado College also wanted to contribute to a stipend for Paul Sotherland after seeing how much work he was putting into making our project hum.

Budget Plans for Next Year ~ We will likely have two project meetings instead of three. Kalamazoo College would also like to use funds remaining in our year one targeted assessment line together with some of our year two targeted assessment funds for a stipend for Paul Sotherland in year two of about $8,000. The work Paul is putting into our project is considerable and we are making great gains as a result.

Respectfully submitted by Anne Dueweke
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teagle Project Budget - Year 1</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>Teagle Fdn</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1 2005-2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming First-Year (Class of 2009)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Seniors (Class of 2005)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Incentives</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIRP Survey</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Colorado</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Earlham</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Data Sharing Conversations @ Kalamazoo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator @ Summer Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teagle Foundation Representative @ Summer Meeting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Assessment Projects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend and meet @ AAC&amp;U Annual Meeting</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI Stipend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Year 1</strong></td>
<td>8,225</td>
<td>7,775</td>
<td>13,275</td>
<td>125,500</td>
<td>154,775</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teagle Project Budget - Year 1</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allocation of Teagle Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming First-Year (Class of 2009)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Seniors (Class of 2005)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Incentives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Colorado</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Earlham</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Data Sharing Conversations @ Kalamazoo</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator @ Summer Meeting</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Assessment Projects</td>
<td>12,964</td>
<td>10,964</td>
<td>10,212</td>
<td>34,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1 organizational meeting @ CC and Earlham</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital funds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Expenditures</th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Expended</th>
<th>Difference +/-</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLA for Incoming First-Year (Class of 2009)</td>
<td>39,000.00</td>
<td>36,000.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA for Seniors (Class of 2005)</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>Included in $36,000 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA - Student Incentives</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
<td>13,503.75</td>
<td>1,496.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Colorado</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>12,651.54</td>
<td>-2,651.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meeting/Student Focus Groups @ Earlham</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
<td>6,085.87</td>
<td>-1,585.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Data Sharing Conversations @ Kalamazoo</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9,000.00</td>
<td>Postponed until Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluator @ Summer Meeting</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>Postponed until Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Assessment Projects</td>
<td>34,140.00</td>
<td>14,311.14</td>
<td>19,828.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2005 meetings @ CC and Earlham</td>
<td>1,110.00</td>
<td>1,331.52</td>
<td>-231.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital funds &amp; miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>750.00</td>
<td>749.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL YEAR 1</td>
<td>125,500.00</td>
<td>84,632.83</td>
<td>40,857.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We budgeted by the head, but ended up paying a flat rate. A second installment of $24,000 will be due in 2009 after the seniors take the CLA.

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Matching Funds</th>
<th>Colorado</th>
<th>Earlham</th>
<th>Kalamazoo</th>
<th>Total Match</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIRP Survey</td>
<td>1,550.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td>3,675.00</td>
<td>3,675.00</td>
<td>3,675.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAC&amp;U/Tegale Conference in Alexandria</td>
<td>351.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>383.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stipend for Project PI</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals and drinks for meetings</td>
<td>1,616.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>11,193.12</td>
<td>4,775.00</td>
<td>8,158.29</td>
<td>24,126.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
between
Kalamazoo College and
Colorado College and Earlham College
for
Disbursement of Grant Funds from the Teagle Foundation
For a Collaborative Value-Added Assessment Project
July 25, 2005

This Memorandum of Understanding is between Kalamazoo College and Colorado College and Earlham College for the disbursement of grant funds from the Teagle Foundation to carry out a collaborative value-added assessment project beginning in July 2005 and continuing through August 2009.

1. As the lead institution, Kalamazoo College will manage funds received from the Teagle Foundation and be primarily responsible for financial reporting to the Foundation.

2. At the beginning of each year of the grant, Kalamazoo College will send budget information to the project team leaders at Colorado College and Earlham College showing the amount of funds to be allocated to each institution in accordance with the project budget developed by all three institutions.

3. The business offices at Colorado and Earlham will set up accounts for expenditures associated with the Teagle project.

4. Project team members at Colorado and Earlham will seek reimbursement from their institutions for project expenditures. The business offices at Colorado and Earlham will require appropriate documentation for all expenditures in accordance with their customary practices. The business offices at Colorado and Earlham will also assure compliance with Kalamazoo College’s documentation requirements.

5. On a quarterly basis, the business offices at Colorado and Earlham will seek reimbursement from Kalamazoo College for expenditures associated with the Teagle Project by submitting the attached reimbursement form and copies of documentation.

6. The project team leaders at Colorado and Earlham will be responsible for tracking expenditures of their portion of Teagle funds according to the categories on the reimbursement form.

7. Kalamazoo College will be responsible for tracking and monitoring expenditures for the project overall.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE  COLORADO COLLEGE  EARLHAM COLLEGE

SIGNATURE  SIGNATURE  SIGNATURE

PRINTED NAME  PRINTED NAME  PRINTED NAME

TITLE  TITLE  TITLE

DATE  DATE  DATE
A Catalyst for Cognizance and Change ~ A Collaborative Project in Value-Added Assessment  
Funded by the Teagle Foundation

Reimbursement Form for Year 1 (July 2005 - June 2006)

Institution

Name of person submitting reimbursement request

Signature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Expenditure (please attach documentation)</th>
<th>Amount to Be Reimbursed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cla for First-Years (Class of 2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cla for Seniors (Class of 2006)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Assessment Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials and Supplies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount to Be Reimbursed

Approved by___________________________________________   Date______________________
APPENDIX TWO

FALL MEETING AT COLORADO COLLEGE
COLORADO ~ EARLHAM ~ KALAMAZOO

A Catalyst for Cognizance and Change
A Collaborative Value-Added Assessment Project Supported by The Teagle Foundation

SCHEDULE OF EVENTS FOR MEETING
COLORADO COLLEGE
14-15 OCTOBER 2005

FRIDAY

8:00 am  Breakfast in TLC3/Instructional Commons
8:30   Remarks by Susan Ashley, Dean of the Faculty and Dean of the College
9:00-noon  Visit CC classes
Noon   Informal conversations over lunch; please sit in mixed groups
1:00-2:45 pm  Presentations and table discussions about campus cultures, CIRP and NSSE data, and other demographic data that will help us see similarities and differences among our three institutions. This, in essence, will be “getting acquainted” using “data.”
  - Amanda Udis Kessler (CC): Beginner’s Guide to NSSE/CIRP
  - Stories from Kalamazoo and Earlham with table discussions
3:00-4:00 (Optional) CC Admissions Tour (Cutler Hall)
4:15-5:15  Presentations and discussions (Colorado’s story)
5:30 pm--- Reception and dinner at Women’s Club, 30 W. Mesa Avenue (just west of Cascade and Monument, two blocks south of campus)

SATURDAY

7:30 am  Breakfast at a restaurant along the route from the Antlers to CC. Coffee, juice will be provided during the morning breakout.
9:00   Campus targeted assessments: presentations/breakouts/discussions
12:00  Lunch
1:00 pm  Resume presentations and discussions (with Colorado College)
4:30 pm? Reception
           Dinner in small groups downtown at various restaurants.

(Unless noted otherwise, all events are in the Instructional Commons at Tutt Library located at 1021 N. Cascade. Phone: 389-6252)
Friday, 14 October

Paul (from Kalamazoo) called us to order – This is an opportunity for conversations about data we normally wouldn’t share. During these conversations, we need to remember that we want the best for each institution, and these no-holds-barred, friendly conversations will foster that.

Earlham will be focusing their study on general education, Colorado College will be focusing their study on learning in the block plan, and Kalamazoo will be focusing their study on the effect of study abroad.

We’d like to chart a course for the next year and ultimately the next 3 years.

At lunch:

Anne Deuweke
Amanda Udis-Kessler
Sally Southwick
Zaide Pixley
Phoebe Lohstroh
Re Evitt
Sandy Wong
Ginger Morgan

Bonita Washington
Bob Southard
Julie Stockenberg
Nate Bower
Mark Hatch
Paul Sotherland
Libby Rittenberg
Bob Grossman

Karen Cunningham
Joe Brockington
Clara Lomos
Deb Jackson
Kari Kalve
Bill Buskirk
LaMont Anderson
Paul Kuerbis

Amanda Udis-Kessler- Introduction to quantitative research methods for the Teagle Project: CIRP and NSSE
CIRP- oldest such instrument for measuring. Survey given to incoming first years- collects demographic data/ what student has done in high school (senior year), what student intends to do at college and beyond. Asks about sense of self and goals and values. Can trends show among colleges, that is, are students typical only for their college, or are their characteristics across the nation- are we getting special interests, special ability kids or just the nation’s standard kid?

NSSE- Alternative to US news and world report rankings, which don’t address what happens in college. Teagle and NSSE interested in value added – what changes occur in students while in college? Eventually, we can combine with CIRP and CLA data. Amanda presented data from broad NSSE categories comparing Kalamazoo, Earlham and CC to look for similarities and differences. (Making these within-house comparisons seems to make sense now; benchmarking our data and making broader comparisons later will help us put our collaborative in perspective.)

[Paul Sotherland cut in to discuss an agreement by all present at the meetings – to facilitate trust and open conversation – because releasing (seemingly sensitive) NSSE data is complicated for some colleges. This agreement is: “Presentations made at the meeting stay within these walls.”]

After breaking into small groups to discuss the data presented and it’s implications, for 45 minutes, the entire group reconvened to make a list of: Similarities and Differences between the three colleges

These items were brought up, written on the board, and discussed

- Page 2- parents total income before tax- Kalamazoo and C high 40’s, Kalamazoo has wealthiest students, Earlham more even distribution of wealth. This may have led to (in bottom box) Earlham is inverse of Kalamazoo and C. That is, goals and values seem different.
All students rate highly “develop meaningful philosophy of life” and “financially well off” is lower/less important.

There are several similarities between the schools, not as unique as we’d like to see

Page 4- Colorado College and Earlham seemed closer in campus culture/environment- personal integration is low but interaction high at K.

40% Pre-med, science natural interests, then many wash out and flow to other departments. Kalamazoo strong science and international studies departments.

[A good question - Students declaring majors, when do they change their majors, why change major?]

Trend in supportive campus environment provides needed support. Perception of support goes down from FY-SY- all schools have first year experience, told about resources, possibly seniors needs change

Pg.5 encourages contact with diverse students – 0.3 decline across the board, all 3 institutions.

Provide support for academic success, this support, according to students, declines FY-SY

Larger issue about American college culture- nurture/pampering our students as opposed to other countries. Difference between caring for and developing.

There is a comfort for parents with: _____ college vs. university of ______. It seems more personal, more secure at a college, rather than state University.

Students have more needs now than in the past – specifically psychological.

The economy has changed, now even $100,000 families get financial aid. What looks like a similarity isn’t much, because affluence doesn’t mean much because stretching to pay for education for 2 or more kids.

How is work-study handled?

Cultural disparities between have’s and have not’s.

Student’s use of Professors first name

Getting-to-know Colorado College

Mark Smith – intro to CC and students

Students have to opt into and select into Colorado College.

Students with a sense of adventure, far from home, most have traveled, lived or studied abroad, international community.

Students can’t hide at Colorado College.

Last two years 4,000 apps, admitted near 500.

75% will decline for top tier liberal arts colleges- cross admits

We used to lose students to CU and DU; we now lose students to Williams, Amherst, Middlebury, Vassar, Dartmouth, Harvard and Brown

We are rated “good to very good” not “excellent”

Earlham has recently increased applications and decreased acceptance

1554 apps, admitted 70% and 30% enrolled.

We heard lots of good things about block plan. What is not working in the block plan or needs improvement?

Everything is punctuated, continuity is difficult to maintain.

Class sizes vs. student choice, if limit is 25, are students annoyed when they can’t get in? We discussed point system. “It’s like gambling” but students like it, think it’s fair, and it’s very meticulously planned by students.
Lots of classes are difficult to get into, possibly increase class size. But students also get annoyed when there are too many students. We don’t cancel classes; one student, we don’t cancel.

30,000 adds/drops each year

Starting a class on the second day, or missing the first day of class is not doable; therefore searching for classes is problematic as well

Block plan is good for students, hard for faculty. Faculty typically teach 6 blocks, 9 month contract, summer off. Expected to maintain scholarly profile – publication w/ students, efforts done at college. Many people get tenure here without a book.

Another negative is faculty recruitment, course load is very heavy.

Does the block plan encourage binging? Work 12-14 hour days and then crash.

Difficult to maintain relationships w/ other students due to flux of block plan, maintain more consistent by being in clubs, activities, community service, those with whom they live.

How block plan can limit ability to form meaningful relationship with community?

Hard to get through amount of reading, turning out papers the next day is hard for “thinkers.”

We spend a lot on outside academic realm to sustain students and relationships despite intensity of the block plan. Like student housing three-year residency requirement, we have Greek system, intramurals, community service, block break breakouts, etc.

First name basis.

Faculty development: helping people learn new things – on quarters, by the time two quarters are done, faculty disperse… is there a space within the block for improving learning?

Mostly at lunch, but occasionally during end of half block, during FYE retreat at end of semester

Faculty does reach to be best; if there is a retreat, will pursue it.

Great strength- encourages creativity and evolution of what you’re doing.

There’s a smorgasbord of choices for classes.

Visitors teach 30%. Which is hard for knowing how to teach in block.

~RECEPTION AND DINNER~

Saturday, 15 October

Getting-to-know Earlham College

Kari Kalve handed out Earlham NSSE data, and noted areas where Earlham wanted to do well and is doing well.

How being Quaker affects Earlham, which is still affiliated and has a number of Quaker meetings. No faith standard of decision making because they “are” Quaker, but Quakerism comes through. Not many students and faculty are Quakers, but many hold to the ideals- peace and social justice. And, there is strong attention to world issues and concern for peace and global studies. Peace suffuses many people’s classes. Many colleges with religious affiliations are flexible, but they don’t try to encourage it in ethos of college, in syllabi, classes etc… it just happens because the employees are significantly committed.

While Earlham is receiving more applications and can become more selective, we still want to bring in students who do not have high preparation, or are high achieving; we look for first generation and lower achieving.

We don’t vote, there are conveners, not “department chairs,” who don’t shape the department. Learn to listen to and work with the faculty to form better departments. Strong opinions are listened to, even if considered wrong- working from consensus- this can make things take longer to work through and to make change.
Quakerism – including the idea that each person has access to truth – is reflected in students. We want representation from students, staff, and administrative in ALL aspects of the college, students involved in all committees, except hiring. Everyone at Earlham is seen as being involved in teaching students; so administrative faculty is faculty too. Has seen a hierarchy developing, but others see tension because the ambiguity between teaching faculty and administrative faculty; administrative feeling devalued. Students seem contemptuous of administrators, but there seems to be little tension between the two.

Q- Governing structure – at Colorado College in FEC (Fac. Exec Com.) at Earlham, is it nebulous? Is faculty part of that? Current president is interested in having a voice in many details; “he micro manages.” There are certain faculty who are “weighty,” but who they are is unclear. There is a clerk of the faculty, who runs the faculty meetings; he is involved in the college conference, the president’s cabinet. Conveners’ lunch includes faculty and administrators- they set agendas. Depends who has more “weight” administrative or teaching faculty; it is basically hashed out (business) on a consensus basis. Can be tedious- but inspiring because voice are heard when decisions are made.

Q- traditional Quaker business meetings? Because not everyone is Christian, or even has any religious orientation, we are sensitive. But we start with silence and end with silence, and have silence between people speaking

There is Quaker worship on campus every Sunday, very sparsely attended, President goes when in town. Can be a wonderful experience because student talk about spiritual growth related to their education, their classes. The goal at Earlham is to have students who reflect on their whole life and how it reflects on their educational experiences.

Q- at Kalamazoo, salaries are a big secret; is it same at Colorado College and Earlham too? It is a big secret at Earlham – big secret why you get your raise, is it merit or something else. No yearly evaluation of any sort. CC has an egalitarian salary schedule, with administrative on real world scale, not teaching faculty scale. Salary scales are published. Faculty sort of controls raise structure; we submit report to administration and typically they say yes. Departments don’t decide percentage of increase for department budgets, but instead administration decides. Strong Egalitarian ethos that is strongly against changing it.

At Earlham, the Provost/Dean decides salaries. Lots of myth about it, you get more credit for newspaper article than journal article in your field. Faculty report, online or other, to the dean what they’ve done. (Larry) Quaker faith influences in profound ways - everyone carries a bit of the truth.

Kalamazoo - We have difficulty educating our students if we are feeling badly for what we aren’t/can’t do. Less egalitarian, but instead market driven. Merit increases small. Where people are in salary distribution is more dependent on what they can earn in “the real world” (mostly business, economics and computer science departments) and on starting salary.

Diversity takes on a whole new meeting, don’t plan for diversity, just ARE diverse. Also, the composition of senior staff- many more women and minorities. Earlham has very high aspirations – for students and faculty – that aren’t possible to meet. Aspirations aren’t “we want to be like you,” but instead try to be the best possible for us, grow from within. Students call for meeting and entire campus talks about principles and practices.

Q- Conveners at Earlham, how are the nominated? Specific terms? Etc…Departments choose their own, typically rotations of three years. ALL faculty eligible, not just tenured. Involves extra work, but conveners don’t have input for salary changes. (As do Chairs at CC.) It’s a service to Earlham. Committee structures influence or bring to faculty meetings recommendations for change, tougher committees have more weight at Earlham. Chairs of committees are decided by the committee. Set terms in committees so weighty faculty can’t just stay in one committee.
Q- What about your curriculum? - Incredibly rich, but maybe too rich given number of faculty. Dean is currently directing conversation about enrollment limits, because would like to have an ideal number. Faculty over-extends…far too many independent studies. We took three years to change General Education- sub committee review, come back with new structure, 7 faculty meetings for it to be approved. Richest curriculum is sciences, languages, writing, social sciences – off the charts for PhD’s. Support for students…lots. Work with students who may not on paper fit profile of Earlham through hard work and faculty engagement (“the tenth”). Some departments 3 and 2 and 3 and 3. Ford Knight grants for faculty/student collaborations, pays faculty for time off (release), budget for materials/travel…minimal compared to the needs of sciences, departments cover the extra costs. Ford Knights ($2 million endowment) are about $100,000 annually dispersed for 1200 students; if not used, carries over the year. Earlham has “May Term” – a three-week, “experience” created for field biologists to be in the field that has blossomed into trips and rich curriculum with 20 offerings every May. Faculty are paid for the “extra” time teaching; counts as a full course for students.

At Colorado College, $54,000 teacher/students work grants and $81,000 students’ grants. (Larry) What we wrestle with is the unevenness across departments in terms of how we support research; economics professors get stipends for helping with theses, but sociology and religion don’t. Science, student stipends and lab costs, but not faculty stipends. But the unevenness causes the problems.

Q - At Earlham, how are courses credited? We went from course credit to credit hour system, which has caused resentments to arise. Favorite issue is difference in teaching load. Departments assign hours for classes (credit hours). There is no common metric, even though there are national standards.

Q - Why switch from quarters to semester? Earlham made the shift ten years ago for several reasons: Attrition problem, fewer stops and starts, fewer people leaving, students getting shut out from summer employment and internships because out so late. Second and Third term, week in between, 20 week stretch, seemed unreasonable for all; by middle of third term everyone exhausted. First years’ 6 week break between 1st and 2nd term unreasonable.

Negatives: Outdoor science program lost 6 week of spring, destroyed (?) off campus study because programs needed to be recast.

Positives: One of many changes that have put us in a better position. When we did strategic planning we had about 1200 students; now we have 1600, run surpluses, and have more and better students. “We make changes best when we’re having trouble, not by getting out in front of fit.” Some curricular arguments, classes benefit from longer time, but some classes had fewer classes a week. For people with research projects in social sciences and humanities, the added time was a big benefit, letting ideas steep in mind.

Getting-to-know Kalamazoo College

Discussion after PowerPoint presentation…
Study Abroad – goal is to immerse students into the culture as much as possible…not with other Kalamazoo students, but with other groups. Logistically complex program – applications due Feb. 1 for Fall programs, Nov. 1 for spring programs, and Oct 15 for winter programs. First-choice placement for 90% of applicants in part because of 18 months of very intensive advising. Minimum overall GPA of 2.5; for some centers, requirement is higher. Typical non-participation is double major or late change in major…GPA issue…some first-generation students, just don’t want to study abroad. We plan curriculum for science majors to be gone fall and winter of junior year.

LUNCH
EARLHAM COLLEGE Targeted Assessment of writing and quantitative reasoning

Earlham discussed rubric, and received many questions about reliability of measures and how to make sure this rubric is a reliable source of grading.

Quantitative (Bill Buskirk) - will make code in order to objectively compare scores since means will be difficult because of small sample size, about which Bill expressed concern. Coming up with statistical answers will be difficult. What will the level of resolution be?

Paul S – Writing assessment - Would feel more comfortable with larger comparisons, rather than specific classes. Suggests comparing abilities walking in to abilities walking across the stage at graduation. We want a means of quantifying the change that happens in 4 years. We ought to see at least a little positive change. Will be able to tell if that facet of your gen ed requirement is working- if students seem to improve. But if decrease- is it faculty development, are students not learning???

They are also doing a writing something at Earlham that they will use the earlier mentioned rubric to grade, maybe 2 from each student in each section. Have you looked around for any quantitative scales that are reliable to help with this? Like the MEDCAT or the racial one? If instrument is short, then why not use a course that is not quantitative and test them to compare.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE Targeted Assessment of study abroad and internationalized curriculum

Want to talk about attitudes and skills, not just learning. (Some faculty are opposed.) Knowledge, skills, and attitudes developed…what’s the value-added of KC and liberal arts in general?

Set knowledge aside because courses can assess that. We want to look at skills and attitude. Different parts of experiential ed are important. Questions to be used are under development. Should they assess how students come in attitude-wise? Taking a look at CIRP data would help.

Q- why are you just looking at study abroad? Maybe look at service learning too (Erik) and community based learning too.

List civic skills that they hope to improve, a set of skills. To add something about efficacy.

Q- how will Kalamazoo measure transference skills? How can they bring the skills back if they are abroad and doing service learning? Service learning, abroad, outdoor, etc… are all experiential learning.

COLORADO COLLEGE Targeted Assessment of learning in the Block Plan

Within the Block

Lamont Anderson discussed his beginning at Colorado College- had students design own research project and gave students directions for a specific research project- not sure which was better.

The question, specifically about senior projects, is a good question.

David - Religion Department concerns, which could benefit from the Teagle project, relates deeply to Block Plan curriculum. Numbers of majors have increased, students do oral presentations, but the quality of the presentations is consistently below what is expected. And their writing is not exquisite either. Religion is considering making requirements clearer and having a more depth in fewer focus. Thinking to separate theory and practice instead of combining. Religion hopes to train in skills, like oral presentation.

Students are interested more in experience than in theory. Simply ask students to be more intellectual, coherent way. – Junior Seminar. Senior seminar is thematic- last few years has been about sacrifice.

Across the Blocks

Nate Bower- Biology Not look just between blocks, but along blocks- what are the advantages of the block plan? Are we getting depth out of blocks? Our students go on to do well is it because they do well on MCAT and GRE, he believes they don’t do as well as things imply they should. Or does Colorado college teach them to be self-starters, or are they nothing.
Re Evitt - how writing supports learning across the curriculum. We should teach writing across all disciplines. Does having students write a lot equal them learning to write? We also have Writing adjunct courses. We also have the Writing Center, well trained and well used. Writing evaluations- worked beautifully early on, not so much anymore because faculty not comfortable with it, 50% or less actually returning them. Writing Emphasis classes are declining. Faculty who teach these are tempted because they are limited to 12, but that’s not enough incentive. Significant number of students who are under-prepared- for example- can’t form a sentence. And we do have a portion of students who can’t do this. We have a barbell. We have a few fabulous writers and then the majority in the middle. How do we improve writing here? Try to beef up adjunct course for students who are doing poorly, support thesis process. Support needs of students who would otherwise flunk out. Require students to develop portfolios/collection of all of their writing.

_Beyond the Block_
Libby Rittenberg discussed the sheet about International Studies program here at Colorado College as compared to the handout. Also hope to piggyback with Kalamazoo.

The other question they had was “when do you declare victory?” Joe Brockington - with high aspirations, how do you keep from “poor me’s”, glass half empty. You have to celebrate the small victories. Positive restlessness- must look at glass half empty and half full - have a positive outlook but not ever really content with what is done. Joe wants to celebrate progress. Why can’t we treat ourselves as well as we treat our students- we aren’t paying for the experience- laugh laugh yes we are. How many alumni become international citizens.

How much of our dissatisfaction with lack of intellectual development is because they haven’t had opportunity to sit down and think about what they’ve done. Students don’t have the opportunity to put it all together- this could lead to the dissatisfaction

Resisting assessment is common. Are we diluting our efforts by looking at three things? Is there something more central? This seems jumbled and confusing – First year just ask the questions, second year focus, then third talk with each other. We’ll get there… These conversations are most important.

CONCLUSION- Paul Kuerbis and Paul Sotherland

CLOSING “RECEPTION”
Appendix Three

Spring Meeting at Earlham College
Catalyst for Cognizance and Change
A Collaborative Value-Added Assessment Project Supported by The Teagle Foundation

Schedule of Events for Meeting
Earlham College
31 March – 1 April 2006

Friday
11:45 p.m.  Lunch available  Richmond Room, Bolling Center
12:45 p.m.  Greetings from
Len Clark, Academic Dean and Provost
1:15 p.m.  Introductions and review of schedule
Bob Southard, Associate Academic Dean and Professor of History and Jewish Studies
1:30 p.m.  International Education at Earlham
Nelson Bingham, Professor of Psychology, Assistant to the President
Howard Lamson, Professor of Spanish and Hispanic Studies
Patty Lamson, Director of International Studies
2:45 p.m.  Break
3:00 p.m.  Institutional Research at Earlham
Mary Ann Weaver, Associate Director of Institutional Research
4:00 p.m.  Campus tour
5:30 p.m.  Reception and Dinner  Old Richmond Inn
(directions included in folder)

Saturday
8:00 a.m.  Continental Breakfast available  Virginia Cottage
8:30  CLA Blues (or…Reading CLA results)
Paul Sotherland, Professor of Biology, Kalamazoo College
10:00 a.m.  Discussion on Assessment/ Summer Planning/ additional follow up
11:30  Lunch and closure
Friday, 31 March

We were welcomed at lunch by Len Clark, Provost of Earlham College; following lunch, Bob Southard extended his welcome, introduced everyone, and gave an overview of our schedule for the meeting. Then, as a means of continuing our “get-to-know-you” sessions at these meetings, we focused our attention on Friday afternoon to international education and institutional research at Earlham.

Nelson Bingham began the conversation about international education with an overview of things international at Earlham by noting that an international focus is at the heart of what is done at Earlham. And, Earlham does it well. Folks at Earlham have a holistic view of internationalism in which international travel is a key, but not sole, facet. Nearly 80% of incoming students choose Earlham College because of its international focus. Other features of Earlham’s internationally directed curriculum include the following:

- An experiential dimension that includes volunteer work
- May Term (one-month) study abroad
- Faculty-led study abroad that frequently develop into life-long connections
- Faculty study-groups that visit other countries
- Considerable attention paid to re-entry
- About one-third of curriculum has an international flavor
- Rich array of international four-year students (1997 – 3%; 2006 – 10%) that enhance campus life through their presence and by engaging in a week-long International Festival, serving as international speakers, living in language houses, and participating in a “model U.N.”

One means of assessing the influence of an international emphasis is to ask alumni about sustained effects after graduation. Surveys have shown that 85% or Earlham alums spent time in another country within ten years of graduation.

Patti and Howard Lamson then shared their (administrator and faculty) views about Earlham’s international emphasis. Below are topics covered.

- Faculty-led groups of 8-15 students for one semester are the study abroad experience at Earlham.
- About 60% of faculty (including administrative faculty) lead these groups
- Leading a program “counts”
- Take graduates as assistants on programs
- May Term trips supplement, but do not compete with, semester programs
- Juniors are the predominant group of students studying abroad, but sophomores and seniors also participate.
- Grades earned while on study abroad return to campus and count in the GPA.
- Small “circles of passion” are what drive the internationalization program.
- What are expected outcomes of the program? (asked a member of the audience) Respect for all people, contribute to the mission of the college…an international focus has a long-standing presences at Earlham.
- We can see them grow; greatest growth occurs after returning home.

BREAK
Mary Ann Weaver led a fascinating guided-tour through Earlham’s extensive Institutional Research activities and website (http://www.earlham.edu/~ir/). She noted that having a “data-driven” president helps support activities in the IR office. Mary Ann fielded many questions about data presented and about how she spends her time.

Many of us then took campus tours, like at Colorado College, to get a “better feel” for the place.

~DINNER AT OLD RICHMOND INN~

Saturday, 1 April

After breakfast, Paul Sotherland led a conversation about first-year results from the CLA. We discovered that students at all three colleges performed in the “as expected” category, with our three “institutional” data points falling slightly below the regression line for CLA Score vs SAT Composite. We saw, and talked about, the enormous scatter of individual CLAvsSAT scores within institutions; clearly, factors other than “innate intelligence” (as revealed by SAT score) contribute to variation in performance on the CLA. When cumulative GPA (as of senior fall) from one institution is plotted as a function of SAT, the lack of correspondence between CLA and SAT is not too surprising.

Folks at Kalamazoo College were (and are) curious about the influence of students’ intellectual development (vis a vis Perry et al) on the CLA performance. They invited first-year students to take the Learning Environment Preference (LEP) survey as a means of quantifying intellectual development of students and found little correlation between LEP and CLA scores. (Seniors who taking the CLA at K’zoo also take the LEP, and when this year’s first-year students take the CLA again as seniors they will be asked to take the LEP again.)

We then had a lengthy “what if” discussion about possible differences in CLA scores between first-year and fourth-year students. We all expect CLA scores to increase (but…how much “improvement” is possible when there is a “ceiling” to the CLA scores?) between matriculation and graduation at all institutions. There’s more room for improvement (vertical movement of CLA scores) at those institutions with lower average SAT and CLA scores, so how much improvement (absolute and relative to the regression line) should we expect? And, probably more importantly, how will we react to changes we observe? Initial answers to these, and other, questions will materialize after we receive CLA scores from our seniors this summer and in four years at the end of our project, when the first-year students take the CLA again as seniors.
Following a short break, Bill Buskirk gave a presentation about what he’s discovering in the quantitative reasoning part of Earlham’s targeted assessment project, and Deb Jackson gave us an update about plans for the writing portion. Briefly, Bill walked us through his testing instrument and then discussed his results. He found some, but not huge, changes occurring in students’ abilities to reason quantitatively when he compared pre-course test results with those from a post-course test. His initial results have caused him to rethink his course and review his test instrument. (One of us questioned the expectation to see much change at all over one semester, and asked about the possibility of comparing abilities of first-year students with those of seniors. Discussion followed…) Deb then described plans for scoring papers written by Earlham students – early and the later in their tenure at Earlham – and enlisted our help with recruiting two paper-raters at both CC and K. We drew up plans for a session to establish inter-rater reliability following the “data sharing” at K in mid-June.

We wrapped up the meeting by discussing our anticipated sequence of meetings through June 2008 and talking about compiling our annual report. Paul S. said he (and Anne) would take the lead on writing the report and would enlist editorial help from Paul K. and Larry at CC and Bob S. at Earlham. We anticipate having future meetings as follows: June06 KC, Oct06 CC, Mar07 KC, June07 EC, Oct07 KC, Mar08 EC, and June08 CC. We’ll see what happens…

~LUNCH AND CLOSURE~
Appendix Four

A Communication Plan for Fall CLA

And A Letter to CLA Recruits
Kalamazoo College - Teagle Project/CLA - Campus Communication Plan
Summer/Fall 2005

1. Letter to incoming class about the Teagle project and the CLA (late July)
2. Ask Provost to report to the President’s Advisory Council on the Teagle project and plans for the CLA this year (late July)
3. Contact Dana Jansma (housing director) about presenting to RAs during training (early August)
4. Follow-up email to incoming class with more details and hot links to 1) K’s press release, 2) Teagle Foundation press release, and 3) pdf of the Atlantic article on the CLA (early August)
5. Information on the Teagle project and the CLA on the parent Web page (early August)
6. (Note: We decided to put information about our Teagle-funded project on the Institutional Research website, and will get that posted by 10 August. After doing that, we will send an email, containing a link to that site, to all first-year students and encourage them to show it to their parents.)
7. Email to Peer Leaders (pl2005) with letter sent to the incoming class (attached), a link to the Teagle Project page, and an invitation to start planning how to allocate “incentive funds.” (early August)
8. Presentation about CLA and entire project to coaches of fall athletic teams to stress importance of their first-year athletes taking the exam before Orientation (August) – email instead
9. Presentation about CLA and entire project to Land/Sea parents (August 24, late afternoon)
10. Meet with Information Services staff about CLA administration in computer labs (mid August)
11. Kalamazoo Project Team meets (Friday, September 2) to make plans
12. Continue to make plans for October Collaborative Meeting (Kalamazoo, Earlham, and Colorado) at Colorado College, Friday and Saturday, October 14-15.
13. Email support and administrative staff to explain CLA and Teagle Project (early September) so they may help answer questions if/when they arise.
14. Email first-year seminar faculty and advisors (early September) to explain Teagle Project and the CLA
15. Meet with RAs to explain project and CLA 9am Tuesday, September 6, at 9 am
16. Fall athletes take the CLA Tuesday, September 6 at 8am and Thursday September 8 at 1pm
17. Meet with peer leaders to explain project and CLA and to make plans for developing fun incentives on Friday, September 9, 2:45-3:15 pm
18. Train peer leaders as CLA proctors, Saturday, September 10, 10:45-11:15
19. Present on the Teagle Project/CLA at the Advising Symposium on Monday afternoon (September 12)
20. Share information with parents on the first day of Orientation (print postcards) (September 13)
21. Meet with first-year seminar faculty to describe the Teagle project and CLA in more detail (demonstrate CLA questions online and go over score report) Friday, September 16, 9:50-10:30am, DE 103 (w/coffee and rolls)
22. First-year students take the CLA on Thursday, September 15, 4-7, Saturday, September 16, 10-1, and Sunday, September 17, from 1-4 and 5-8.
23. DRINK SCOTCH … LOTS OF IT
Greetings from mid-summer on our "fair Arcadian hill." We hope your summer is going well, and we trust you are looking forward to the beginning of your college career at least as much as we are. In addition to sending you greetings from Kalamazoo College, we write to invite you to join us in a very important collaboration that will last for at least the next four years.

Along with Colorado College and Earlham College, Kalamazoo College has begun a research project, supported with a grant from the Teagle Foundation, in which we will systematically assess the extent to which our students become better educated. Ours is one of six projects, involving colleges and universities from across the country, that will demonstrate the effectiveness of a liberal arts education. We will need, therefore, to obtain reliable measures of your abilities when you begin college and again shortly before you graduate in 2009 to obtain a clearer understanding of changes in students effected by Kalamazoo College. While trying to be as unobtrusive as possible, we will periodically ask you to help us with this endeavor by completing nationally-normed surveys or exams. The first of these will occur during fall orientation when we will ask you to complete the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) examination. We will send you more details about these via email later, but here’s a quick snapshot of the CLA.

The CLA focuses on assessing what many would agree is at the core of a college education - the ability to think critically, reason analytically, and communicate in writing clearly. All of our students have abilities in these areas when they matriculate, and everyone anticipates improvement in these abilities during the college years (and beyond!). We want to measure how much students change while they are here. Two types of tasks comprise the CLA: Performance Tasks assess ability to interpret, analyze, and synthesize information in simulated "real life" situations; Writing Prompts evaluate ability to articulate complex ideas, examine claims and evidence, support ideas with relevant reasons and examples, and sustain a coherent discussion. While that might seem a little daunting (especially in mid-summer!), we all need to remember that we will focus on assessing the College’s effectiveness in enhancing the education of our students rather than on demonstrated abilities of individual students. To that end, we will be using data we collect in the aggregate to illustrate how much your class as a whole develops over four years.

We invite you to collaborate with us in this intriguing study. We don’t want to put too fine of a point on this...but, the study on which we are embarking is a big deal, and you will play a key role in helping it be a success. Ideally, you and all of your classmates will participate in this project and will put forth your best effort, when completing surveys and taking exams, to help us gather the most reliable information possible.

We look forward to welcoming you to Kalamazoo College in the fall and starting our project.

Sincerely,

Paul Sotherland
Chair of Biology and Project Director

Zaide Pixley, Director
First Year Experience

Anne Dueweke, Director
Institutional Research
Dear SeniorFirstName:

You have been selected to participate in a study of great importance to the College. With funding from the Teagle Foundation, 'K' has undertaken a four-year study of student learning in collaboration with Colorado College and Earlham College. Our study is gaining national attention through organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities and The New York Times.

**What Are We Asking?**

We invite you, and other selected seniors, to take the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), an online cognitive test, on **Saturday, February 18th, at 1:00PM**. The CLA will take at most 90 minutes to complete and will be done in a computer lab on campus. We will also ask you to complete a Learning Environment Preferences (LEP) form right after you complete the CLA. The LEP will take no more than 20 minutes. In a nutshell, we are asking you to devote two hours of one of your Saturdays this quarter to the project.

**What Are the Benefits of Participation?**

As a thank-you for your time and effort, you will receive a Beaner's travel mug and $20 of Beaners' Bucks as soon as you complete the CLA and LEP. Your name will also be entered in a prize drawing that will be held during the Senior Awards Ceremony in Spring Quarter. Prizes will include T-shirts from favorite local establishments, iPod Shuffles, and gift certificates.

**What Are the Goals of the Study?**

In order to maintain sound research methodology, we cannot divulge our goals before you take the CLA and the LEP. However, we will hold a reception for study participants at some point after you take these tests during which we will fully explain the study and its goals.

**How Do I Sign Up?**

Simply fill out the form at the bottom of this letter and return it to Dr. Paul Sotherland through campus mail. We will then send you more instructions. Please reply by **Monday, January 23rd**.

**Questions?**

Contact Dr. Paul Sotherland (x7012 paulsoth), Dr. Kiran Cunningham (x7124 kcunning), or Ms. Anne Dueweke (x7418 adueweke). We'll be happy to talk with you more about the project.

Kiran Cunningham   Anne Dueweke    Paul Sotherland
Anthropology     Institutional Research    Biology

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Please return to Dr. Paul Sotherland by **Monday, January 23rd**.

___ Yes, I will participate    ___ No, I am not able to participate

Name:__________________________________________________________ ID Number:____________________________

How can we best reach you?

Email:_________________ Cell Phone:_________________ Other:_________________
Appendix Five

CLA Data
INSTITUTIONAL RESULTS FROM FALL 2006 CLA OF FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS

Figure 1
Relationship between mean SAT scores and mean total CLA scores for Freshmen at your institution and other institutions

Regression
Intercept 410
Slope 0.63
R-square 0.78

Relationships between mean CLA and SAT scores among schools are markedly similar to those observed in previous cycles of Freshmen CLA testing.

CLA Total = 785 + 0.4(SAT)
$r^2 = 0.14$
$r = 0.37$

EXAMPLE OF INDIVIDUAL RESULTS FROM ONE INSTITUTION
FALL 2006 CLA OF FIRST-YEAR STUDENTS

Figure 2
Relationship between Scale SAT/ACT and Scale Total Score on CLA

Regression
Intercept 410
Slope 0.63
R-square 0.78

Relationships between mean CLA and SAT scores among schools are markedly similar to those observed in previous cycles of Freshmen CLA testing.

CLA Total = 785 + 0.4(SAT)
$r^2 = 0.14$
$r = 0.37$
APPENDIX SIX

TARGETED ASSESSMENT PROJECTS
COLORADO COLLEGE TARGETED ASSESSMENT

Colorado College's unique curriculum structure, the Block Plan, is the target of further study as part of the Teagle Foundation supported grant to study the value added of a liberal education. The Block Plan will be studied and assessed multi-dimensionally to determine how learning and teaching can be enhanced. What do we do well within the plan and what might we refine?

At a Faculty Fall Forum in late August 2005, faculty members gathered to generate observations, questions, and challenges about the Block Plan. From that meeting emerged a proposed structural framework for on-going conversations and investigation. We could examine our curricular structure from three perspectives: within the block (e.g., How does a block's intensity lend itself to learning that can not be accomplished within a semester or quarter schedule?), across the block (How can courses across the blocks be linked?), and beyond the block (How might off campus study be better integrated into the liberal arts experiences of students?). Last year the Crown Faculty Center sponsored a monthly luncheon discussion, Thinking Inside and Outside the Block Box. That series continues this year and provides an important venue for discussion generally and more specifically for the Teagle targeted study.

Recently, the Teagle Committee, composed of faculty members and administrators, met to narrow the focus of the Colorado College targeted assessment. We have initial agreement on a central question that will drive our investigation: What is CC’s effect on students as we prepare them to do independent work on senior projects? This question combines elements of all three structures, within, across, and beyond. The Teagle initiative will allow us to explore varying departmental approaches to the spectrum of senior capstone experiences at the College – practica, theses, senior papers, independent research, and performances. Possible sub-questions might include: What are the approaches departments use to prepare students to do research? Is there a developmental approach (for both knowledge and skills) that seems effective? How might courses be sequenced within a major to greatest effect? What aspects of the intense learning within the block plan enhance student writing, critical thinking and analytical reasoning and what aspects should be refined? What is the value added of the current approach to preparing students for a senior capstone project?

We will soon have a refined set of questions and a detailed research plan. Already, though we are quite sure that we will be combining qualitative and quantitative approaches to data collection. We wish to examine student products but also tap stories or “scripts” from both students (in process and at completion) and faculty. And, we are likely to target certain departments (particularly those with long-standing senior capstone experiences) within the three divisions of the college: humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. We have two readily available external sources of observers including faculty from our partner colleges. Each year we also have several departments undergoing external review and we might have the external visitors involved in interviews or in examining senior products. Quantitative data might emanate from carefully constructed surveys and from the CLA and NSSE. We will be particularly interested in examining how these data are correlated with student growth, knowledge, and skills over time as demonstrated in senior products (papers, theses, performances, etc.)?

While our study is particularly germane to our institution, we believe that what we learn over the next three years can inform others about how to better prepare students over the four years of their college careers. Moreover, we hope to find information that will better inform other institutions that utilize intense schedules either in January or May terms or in summer programs.
In academic year 2002-2003 the Earlham College faculty, after seven faculty meetings carried out over two semesters, provisionally approved a new set of general education requirements. The previous requirements had been based on the notion of different kinds of knowledge, and were organized according to divisions (e.g., natural sciences and math, fine arts, etc); in contrast, the new requirements are based on the notion of epistemological approaches—different “ways of knowing” (e.g. scientific inquiry, quantitative reasoning, aesthetic judgment, etc.)—and are designed to cut across divisions. Furthermore, on the new system, some courses simultaneously satisfy two requirements. The other major change in Earlham’s gen-ed program occurred in the courses designed to develop students’ skills in critical reading, effective writing, and thoughtful discussion. The former “Humanities” series, which required a shared set of texts in all sections of “Humanities A” (taken during the first semester) and “Humanities B” taken during the second semester), was transformed into two separate required courses: “Interpretive Practices” courses offer a set of texts from different genres and/or disciplines around a common theme (unique to each section); Earlham Seminars offer students the opportunity to explore a topic within a particular discipline. In addition, both of these new required first-year classes can serve as gateways to further study.

Because debates about general education often rest too much on opinion and too little on data, and because Earlham’s gen-ed reforms were slow in coming, we built periodic assessment into the proposal that the faculty approved, with the understanding that in five years we would revisit the changes and determine if further adjustments were needed. Faculty wanted to know not just how well students liked their courses and how easily the system functioned; in addition—and more important—they wished to know whether students in fact were learning the specific skills and ways of knowing promised in the requirement descriptions. At the May 2005 AAC&U Institute in Providence, R.I., the Earlham team arrived at two projects, which are now in process and are funded by the Teagle Foundation. These projects (described below) make an appropriate complement to the CLA tests, since they, too, seek to measure outcomes in liberal learning.

The first of these projects studies how well students learn to write clear, expository prose in Interpretive Practices classes and Earlham Seminars. (Although these two classes also emphasize reading and discussion skills, these latter two are not nearly as amenable to effective evaluation as expository writing is—thus, the focus on writing.) The point is not to “test” individual students, nor are individual instructors being evaluated with regard to teaching effectiveness; in fact, elaborate procedures will be followed to ensure anonymity on all levels, so it will not even be possible to determine results of individual students or instructors’ sections. The second project studies improvement in quantitative reasoning in the 100+ first-year students in one of our most popular science classes—Ecological Biology—through pre- and post-testing of their quantitative skills.

Both projects are now under way, and we plan to review the results of the 2005-2006 academic year in summer, 2006. With regard to the first-year writing requirements, we have agreed upon rubrics for the writing samples, and will invite and compensate faculty from Colorado and Kalamazoo to read an evaluate these papers. As for the quantitative reasoning requirement, Prof. William Buskirk, who teaches Ecological Biology and who is part of the review team, will have these compiled for the rest of us. We look forward to reporting the results, and assessing this assessment, with our Teagle colleagues at future meetings.

Bob Southard (History Dept.)
Deborah Jackson (Sociology and Anthropology)
Scoring Rubric for Earlham College’s First-Year Writing Assessment
(Revised by Evaluating Team, 6/3/06)

This rubric has been developed for use in assessing the overall effectiveness of Earlham’s first-year seminars (Interpretive Practices courses, and Earlham Seminars) in helping students improve their expository writing skills.

The rubric works as follows: Each of the following criteria is evaluated on a scale of 5 to 1, with each number corresponding to an evaluative term. These terms are:

5 Excellent
4 Very good
3 Good/competent
2 Minimally adequate
1 Inadequate

There will be no attempt to convert these numbers/terms to letter grades, either individually (each criterion separately) or as a composite. Rather, letter grades (including pluses and minuses) will be determined separately.

Below are the criteria, with descriptions of what constitutes excellent performance, and what constitutes poor performance, with regard to each.

Content/Intellectual Richness

Excellent (5): creativity in responding to assignment; depth of thought evident; contains intriguing/unusual insights; novel connections among ideas.

Poor (1): lacks creativity in responding to the assignment; displays shallow thought; lacks intriguing/unusual insights; predictable and uninspired.

Textual analysis/argumentation (thesis)

Excellent (5): strong introduction with a thesis statement that is clear, effective and engaging; strong conclusion that not only serves to unify the paper, but also suggests further questions or ideas; thorough knowledge of text(s) demonstrated; sound thesis, convincingly argued; well-chosen examples from text(s) to support each point; sufficient references to text(s), sufficient direct quotes.

Poor (1): no discernable introduction, or intro lacks a thesis statement; no conclusion (i.e., paper simply stops after the last point has been made); reveals lack of knowledge of text(s); no clear thesis, or no support for thesis; no examples from text(s); insufficient reference to text(s); no direct quotes from text(s), or too heavy a reliance on lengthy quotes from text; writing is meandering and/or repetitive.
Organization/Structure

Excellent (5): paragraphs in the body of the paper are logically ordered for maximum clarity of the argument; clear topic sentence for each paragraph that makes the point of the paragraph clear; smooth transitions between parts (i.e., sentences, paragraphs, sections).

Poor (1): illogical ordering of paragraphs; no clear topic sentence for all or most paragraphs; no transitions between parts (i.e., sentences, paragraphs, sections).

Correspondence to the Assignment/Formatting

Excellent (5): paper is in compliance with every aspect of the assignment, including length; paper complies with accepted standards (or standards specified by the instructor) with regard to such features as font size/style, spacing, margins, title page, headers/footers/page numbering, citations, and bibliographic information.

Poor (1): paper is completely out of alignment with what the assignment asks students to do, and/or is significantly shorter or longer than the length specified in the assignment; not in compliance with accepted standards (or standards specified by the instructor) with regard to such features as font size/style, spacing, margins, title page, headers/footers/page numbering, citations, and bibliographic information.

Style

Excellent (15): geared to an appropriate audience; achieves language appropriate to the assignment; demonstrates a confident authorial voice; demonstrates clarity of expression, well-chosen words and phrases, free of jargon and clichés; concise writing, without extraneous material or repetition.

Poor (1): geared either too high (assumes too much knowledge on the part of the reader) or too low (assumes too little knowledge on the part of the reader); language is inappropriate to the assignment; formulaic, with no unique author’s voice coming through; riddled with jargon and/or clichés; writing is meandering and/or repetitious.

Mechanics

Excellent (5): contains no errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

Poor (1): contains numerous errors in grammar, punctuation, and spelling.
KALAMAZOO COLLEGE TARGETED ASSESSMENT
ASSESSMENT OF AN INTERNATIONALIZED UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Research Questions

1. What are the attitudes and skills of intercultural/international understanding? (Please see outcomes list at end of research plan)

2. What are the particular catalysts for the development of these attitudes and skills over the course of a Kalamazoo College education?

3. To what extent do students transfer the attitudes and skills from one kind of experience to another over the course of their Kalamazoo education?

4. To what extent are these attitudes and skills developed through study abroad, and how does this vary by program and by length of program?

5. How do we assess the degree to which these attitudes and skills develop in students?

Research Design

Literature Review:

1. Develop list international/intercultural attitudes and skills that constitute Kalamazoo College educational outcomes. (RQ#1)

2. Generate a preliminary set of catalysts that trigger development of the attitudes and skills. (RQ#2)

Data Collection:

1. Gather the following set of data about Kalamazoo College first year students (baseline data)
   a. Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) results (cognitive) – n=222
   b. Learning Environment Preferences (LEP) questionnaire (cognitive, affective) – n=219

2. Gather the following set of data on Kalamazoo College seniors as outcome data
   a. CLA results (cognitive) – n=100
   b. LEP results (cognitive, affective) – n=100 (same group as (a))
   c. For students taking CLA, gather the following information:
      i. Courses taken at K
      ii. Major
      iii. Study Abroad program
      iv. Participation in other experiential education opportunities – service learning, land-sea, etc.
      v. Other significant international experience
   d. Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) results (affective) – n=40 (subset of CLA students)
   e. Interviews – n=40 (same students as (c))
3. Gather the following set of data on Kalamazoo College juniors to learn about catalysts for and transference of knowledge, attitudes and skills (RQ#2,3)
   a. Interviews – n=30 (10 returning Kalamazoo Project for Intercultural Communication (KPIC) students, 10 returning non-KPIC students, 10 non-Study Abroad students)
   b. IDI results – n=30 (same group as (a))
   c. For these 30 students, gather the following information
      i. Courses taken at K
      ii. Major
      iii. Study Abroad program
      iv. Participation in other experiential education opportunities – service learning, land-sea, etc.
      v. Other significant international experience

Analysis: Questions to ask of the data

1. Is there a correlation between the development of international/intercultural attitudes and skills and cognitive development? (compare CLA with IDI/LEP data)

2. What have been the catalysts for development of international/intercultural attitudes and skills in experiences of Kalamazoo College students? (analyze interview data)

3. To what extent do students transfer attitudes and skills developed in one context to another context? (analyze interview data)

4. What other factors seem to mediate, or intervene in, the relationship between students’ involvement in experiential education opportunities at K and their development of international/intercultural attitudes and skills?

5. What is surprising?
With the goal of fostering engaged and responsible citizenship in the multicultural societies of today’s world, Kalamazoo College expects its graduates to be internationally competent, that is, equipped with attitudes and skills of intercultural understanding; knowledge about historical events and the relevance of history to understanding today’s world; knowledge about the multifaceted ways that global economic, political and social currents shape and are shaped by local, national, and international dynamics; and an understanding of and appreciation for the cultural and biological diversity upon which the world’s human and non-human life depends.

Kalamazoo College expects its graduates to be equipped with the following knowledge, skills and attitudes:

**Knowledge**
- Understand that we are “cultural beings” and our own beliefs and values reflect our own culture
- Knowledge of their own culture
- Knowledge of U.S. history, society, and the plurality of U.S. culture
- Knowledge of cultures beyond U.S. borders
- Understand the connections between U.S. history and global historical trajectories
- Knowledge of global economic, technological, and environmental complexity and interdependency and the ways that these are played out at local, regional, national, and international levels
- Understand the nature of language and how it reflects diverse cultural perspectives – i.e. the way language organizes information and thought processes and reflects culture
- Understand the ways that their own actions have impacts nationally and internationally

**Skills**
- Know how to learn in class and experientially
- Use effective communication, listening, and observation skills to enhance intercultural understanding
- Know the difference between description, interpretation, and evaluation, and able to initially bracket interpretation and evaluation as “participant observers” in another culture
- Use diverse cultural frames of reference to think critically and creatively solve problems
- Able to interpret U.S. social, political and economic dynamics from a perspective other than the U.S.
- Adapt, reinterpret and restructure behavior when in a new context, recognizing different cultures, values, and norms
- Use coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations
- Use foreign language to communicate, both orally and in writing
- Use foreign language skills as a tool for cross-cultural learning and intercultural understanding
- Know how to be an effective and responsible citizen in today’s world

**Attitudes**
- Humble in the face of difference and willing to be in the position of a learner
- Tolerant of ambiguity and unfamiliarity
- Resistant to an “us vs. them” attitude
- Sensitive to and respectful of personal and cultural differences
- Empathetic and able to take multiple perspectives
- Open to learning and positively oriented to new opportunities, ideas, and ways of thinking
- Curious about global issues and cultural differences, and willing to seek out international or intercultural opportunities
- Have a sense of efficacy

[Campus Internationalization Leadership Team, Spring 2004]