Introduction

In the following report we will review the activities of the Teagle Assessment Scholars over the last year. We will then review our assessment of these activities, and finally turn to a broader discussion about the role of the Teagle Assessment Scholars in the future work of the Center.

This report comes at the end of a complicated year for the Center of Inquiry. Institutional demand to participate in the Wabash National Study continued to grow this year. We attribute much of this demand to the powerful work of the Teagle Assessment Scholars. More than anything, the Teagle Scholars transform the "social sciencey" flavor of the Wabash National Study into an open, personalized, culturally-aware process of inquiry. Teagle Assessment Scholars help make assessment about people rather than tests.

At the same time, our close work with institutions has led us to question the architecture of the Wabash National Study as an efficient mechanism for helping institutions improve their impact on student learning. Finally, the recent financial crash has hurt all of higher education, but this pain has been especially acute at Wabash College and at the Center's most generous benefactor—the Lilly Endowment, Inc.

The lessons learned from the Teagle Assessment Scholars and the Wabash National Study, combined with the challenging financial situation that Wabash College and the Center of Inquiry currently face, have led us to imagine a different future for the Center. Since it is so tightly centered around the work of the Teagle Scholars, we will describe that future at the end of this document.

Background

The initial premise of the Teagle Assessment Scholars Program (TASP) has been that the Center of Inquiry should support the activities of liberal arts colleges to assess liberal arts outcomes. In part a reaction to the national discourse calling for colleges and universities to become more involved in assessment and accountability, and in part an initiative well-timed to take advantage of the growing interest on many campuses to control their assessment agenda internally, the TASP aims to provide particular expertise to institutions that might benefit from hearing an outside voice or learning about a best practice in carrying out their work in evaluation and assessment.

In our original grant proposal, we suggested that the goals of the program included the development of an assessment help center, the publication and presentation of analytical and practical work that would create a community of practice for assessment, and most importantly, the development of a network of “assessment scholars” that would:
• Make presentations on assessment at liberal arts colleges.
• Participate in and facilitate institutional retreats for administrators and faculty at our facilities at Wabash College.
• Lead and participate in assessment conferences at Wabash College.
• Present assessment workshops before and after national conferences.
• Participate in site visits for the Wabash National Study at liberal arts campuses.

In our Year 2 report, we identified the following more specific goals for our work this year:
• Revise the methodology by which we pay Teagle Scholars. (Going forward, except in extraordinary circumstances, Scholars will be paid $500 per campus visit. The yearly retainer is no longer applicable.)
• Invite institutions participating in the 2008 administration of the National Study to nominate "Wabash Assessment Fellows"—people who will learn from current Scholars, help promote the activities of the Study on their campus and other participating campuses, and perhaps become Teagle Scholars at some point in the future.
• Develop a process for inducting additional Teagle Scholars.
• Cautiously consider ways to expand the types of consulting the Teagle Scholars offer, perhaps by considering how we may be able to support the process of preparing for accreditation at the campus level.
• Ask Scholars to help at the two launch meetings for the 2008 administration of the Wabash National Study, August 6-8 and 13-15, 2008.

Activities

This year, 20 Teagle Scholars have engaged in 44 separate assessment activities. Among the highlights of this year’s activities are:

1. the incorporation of Wabash Study Assessment Scholars (the “junior scholars” tentatively called "Wabash Assessment Fellows" in last year's report) into site visits to begin to develop the next generation of Teagle Scholars,
2. the facilitation of assessment activities at liberal arts colleges such as Middlebury, Amherst, and Kalamazoo,
3. a series of Scholar-led workshops at national and regional conferences designed to give campus participants “hands-on” experience developing action plans from student learning data,
4. the undertaking of a very successful retention conference based on Wabash National Study data, and
5. providing critical support for the site visits connected with the Wabash National Study.

Looking at the specific task list for Year 3 activities, we did succeed in revising the method of paying Teagle Scholars—we now normally provide $500 per activity, but no yearly retainer. This has resulted in a more effective husbanding of resources, and no obvious decline in level of participation.

We succeeded in inviting nominations for Wabash Study Assessment Scholars (WSASs) from institutions participating in the National Study resulting in 24 inaugural WSASs, or "wise-asses" as they are affectionately called. We were able to include five WSASs in campus site visits this year, and anticipate increasing this aspect of the program next year. Evaluative feedback from the WSASs is discussed and included below. This method of attracting new potential scholars was so successful that we did not need to develop independent recruitment strategies to supplement our network of 27 Teagle Assessment Scholars (see Appendix A for a list of Teagle Scholars and WSASs).
This year, we wanted to try to expand the scope of Teagle Scholar activities. After inconclusive conversations with NEASC and with people associated with Middle States, we have tentatively backed off a possible plan to more closely identify with accreditation activities as a possible expansion of the Scholars’ niche. Instead, we chose to develop data workshops as a way of identifying assessment-related activity for the Scholars that might create new opportunities.

Our decision to focus on data workshops stems from our work with institutions. We have come to realize that a lack of data is not what prevents institutions from making changes to improve student learning. Most institutions have more data than they can use, and certainly more than they know how to use. All too often, institutional data that could be used for assessment remains in the hands of a small group of people, sometimes simply because they don’t know what to do with all the binders, reports, and data files they’ve collected over time. For change to happen, people on campus must see the data, have opportunities to think about and discuss the data with colleagues, and be prompted to develop action plans for courses and programs based on the data. Our data workshops are designed to do just this.

We began to develop the data workshop format at the October 2008 Teagle Foundation conference, "How Can Student Learning Best Be Advanced? Achieving Systematic Improvement in Liberal Education." In this first iteration, we created data and supporting documents for a fictitious institution. We asked workshop participants to review all the information, figure out what the most pressing issue was, and develop an action plan to address that issue. We refined our data workshops at later AAC&U and NEASC conferences, and we moved from using fictitious data to asking participants to bring actual data from their own institutions.

Another turning point in the development of data workshops came in May 2009 when the Center of Inquiry invited Wabash Study institutions to a data workshop focused on retention. Teams of faculty, staff, and administrators from eight Wabash Study institutions participated in the retention workshop. During the four-day conference, participants examined data from the Wabash National Study and other sources (e.g., NSSE, CIRP, institutional retention analyses) to see what they could learn about student persistence at their institution and then develop an action plan to improve retention based on the data. Working sessions for institutional teams were scheduled around four plenary sessions which built upon each other, moving from a broad overview of current thinking about student retention to a specific institutional case study. One Teagle Scholar worked with each institutional team for the duration of the workshop. (See Appendix B for the agenda, participant list, and action plan worksheet from the retention workshop.)

Participants’ feedback on the retention workshop was generally quite positive. People felt that the workshop was structured well, specifically with the progression of plenary sessions and the way the schedule alternated between plenaries and time for teams to analyze data and work on their plans with their Teagle Scholar. We did run into a few problems with the data files we provided to institutions, which created delays for some of the groups and prevented them from fully utilizing their time. We also realized that some participants would have benefited from a more structured SPSS training session. We will incorporate the feedback and lessons learned from this workshop into our planning for future data workshops. We hope to hold several additional data workshops in the 2009-10 academic year.

Including the data workshops described above, we were involved in 15 conferences, workshops, and symposia this year. Twenty Teagle Scholars participated in these meetings.
overall, giving presentations, facilitating workshop sessions, and assisting institutions with program development and assessment efforts. Thirteen Teagle Scholars participated in last summer's two launch meetings for the Wabash National Study alone—meetings that went very well by all reports and according to the written comments of the participating institutions.

Furthermore, on 25 different occasions, we traveled to institutions to conduct site visits for the Wabash National Study, engage in a consultancy, conduct workshops, act as an outside evaluator, or give presentations. Nine Teagle Scholars assisted us with these visits. The majority of these visits were to institutions in the Wabash National Study. However, we also had seven engagements with non-study institutions this year, including visits to:

- Middlebury College to help with assessment in preparation for their upcoming NEASC accreditation and to conduct workshops for faculty and staff on using NSSE data and grading writing assignments,
- Amherst College to help faculty develop an experimental advising program to identify student growth on outcomes during their first year,
- Kalamazoo College to conduct a initial “culture audit” for their Teagle grant and suggest opportunities that would help them successfully implement the grant by transforming Kalamazoo into a more vibrant learning community,
- Gallaudet University to give a presentation on Wabash National Study findings during a campus retreat for faculty and staff,
- Southwestern University to lead a faculty development workshop, and
- Bucknell University to review their institutional research office.

We see engagements such as these with non-study institutions as a way to increase the reach of the TASP in a form that contributes an income stream. (See Appendix C for a full list of Teagle Scholar activities.)

**Appraisal**

As part of our ongoing evaluation of the Center's work, we have conducted phone interviews with all the Teagle Scholars and WSASs to ask them about strengths and weaknesses of the Teagle Assessment Scholar Program. We have also interviewed faculty and staff at each of the institutions we have visited, and gathered written evaluations of all of our workshops and conferences at the Center.

Teagle Scholars and WSASs were extremely positive about the TASP during our interviews. Scholars mentioned many benefits from participating in the program. Many of the benefits of the TASP centered around five major themes, described below.

**1) Professional development – learning new insights for one’s own job/ complement to day-to-day job**

The most common theme that emerged during the calls is that participating in this program gave the scholars experiences that they could directly apply to their current jobs. This theme mainly emerged among the Teagle Scholars rather than the Wabash Study Assessment Scholars. The specifics of these connections were varied. For example, one scholar discussed how she has improved her writing of application and implication sections in research papers. She also sees how the lessons she has learned will play a role in how she develops courses in her new faculty position starting in the fall. Another scholar discussed how he has changed the faculty development workshops he leads as a result of the things he has learned as a scholar.
Also, he mentioned that he pursued and received a grant as a result of being in this program. The Teagle Scholar experience intensified another scholar’s commitment to assessment and this work. Yet another scholar discussed how his experiences have given him valuable insights into thinking about and using the existing data at his institution. Another scholar felt his participation in the program gave him insights and connections that helped him secure his own Teagle grant for work at his home institution. Finally, a scholar suggested that her experience as a Teagle Scholar helped build assessment at her institution. She feels she was better equipped to talk to the assessment committee and could provide detailed suggestions about assessment. She also thinks her experience in the TASP helped move her institution along in terms of developing common learning outcomes and assessment plans.

2) Developing relationships with new colleagues and networking

Many scholars also commented on the networking benefit of the TASP. One scholar said that joining a community of people who are devoted to assessment and student learning/success has been profoundly enriching and professionally gratifying. She continued by saying that she had never experienced this level of camaraderie and collegiality on this topic—a topic that so often gets push-back from colleagues. Another scholar said that this program provides support and nurturing for assessment work for individuals who are often isolated on their home campuses. The same sentiment was echoed by yet another person who said that we should not underestimate the value of the professional network and friendships that have developed. He continued by saying he values the professional identity of being a Teagle Scholar when he goes to conferences and meetings.

3) Learning about campus structures, politics, and data pathways and learning to negotiate them

Four scholars discussed how working with institutions as a Teagle Scholar during site visits and workshops gave them valuable insights about how campus structures and politics impact the dissemination and use of data. For example, one scholar said that getting an institution to actually use data rests heavily on the governance structure. Being a Teagle Scholar taught him how to think about those processes and define who has agenda-setting authority, what the data pathways are, etc. He says he has been better able to help other institutions with this knowledge and is thinking about how things move (or don’t move) through the governance structure at his own institution. Another scholar discussed how Wabash National Study site visits are different from visits he has done for things like departmental reviews, because Wabash Study visits have been more pan-institutional—they are more holistic and about the entire institution. This provides valuable perspectives about campus structures and various points of view, even on signature programs. A third scholar said that her work as a scholar has been a great way to learn about real politics, real campus structures, and constraints that impact how and if things get done at an institution. It has been a great way to learn how to negotiate through all of these structures, she says. Finally, two scholars discussed how their Teagle Scholar experiences helped them try new ways of talking about change on their campuses rather than falling into the same old typical patterns. For example, one scholar said his experiences enabled him to propose different ways of doing things. He said these attempts aren’t always successful, but he feels he has learned different ways of thinking and doing.
4) Understanding the WNS data better – learning how to present study data to one’s own campus and learning ways to build campus support for the study

This theme was only discussed by the Wabash Study Assessment Scholars. These individuals work at schools currently participating in the first year of Wabash National Study (WNS), and they all participated in a single site visit at another WNS institution. Thus, their immediate reference point was to apply this experience to the implementation and dissemination of the WNS. For example, one WSAS said that when he was asked by a senior administrator to present WNS information, he was more prepared as a result of his site visit experience. Another WSAS discussed how her site visit experience helped her know which campus constituencies she needed to get involved with the WNS at her institution and better understand how to contextualize the data as it comes in. Finally, another person discussed how participating in a site visit gave him concrete ideas of how to best organize a site visit on his own campus in the fall.

5) Building credibility on one’s own campus

Being a Teagle Scholar has also increased the participants’ credibility on their own campuses according to a few scholars. For example, one scholar discussed how being a Teagle Scholar increased her credibility at a critical time at her institution as several initiatives came together to boost the role of assessment at the school. Another scholar said that being able to reference that he is a Teagle Scholar and that he works with the Center of Inquiry has given him additional credibility on his own campus.

Scholars also had ideas about ways we could improve the TASP. Scholars indicated that they would like to receive more communication from the Center about the program. They would like to know what’s going on with the program even if they cannot participate in activities. They also want to be informed of, if not involved in, follow-up work after activities—e.g., what does an institution do after a site visit or workshop, how did an institution evaluate our work, what type of follow-up contact should scholars have with institutions? Several scholars also suggested that they would benefit from more specific training on topics including quantitative and qualitative research methodology, the Wabash National Study, and using data. Suggestions for site visits included providing more structured planning and preparation before the visit (e.g., pre-visit phone call with the institution, understand the institution’s specific goals for a site visit) and providing scholars with more feedback after the visit. As we will describe below, many of these suggestions have been incorporated into our vision for the future of the Wabash National Study and the Teagle Scholars Program.

Finally, many scholars lamented time constraints that prevented them from being involved in more TASP activities. We are fortunate because we have tapped a group of talented, motivated, and engaged people for the Teagle Scholars, but this means that they have significant responsibilities at their institutions, they are often involved in many projects on their campuses, and they are typically the first ones called when a new initiative begins. Teagle Scholars value and enjoy their work with the TASP, but they also often feel a tension between the demands of their jobs and the opportunities provided by Teagle Scholar activities. We fully expect that Teagle Scholars will continue to struggle with time constraints, and this suggests that we need to make sure that the TASP is a sufficient size so that at least a few scholars are available for each activity.
Teagle Assessment Scholars and the Center of Inquiry

The Teagle Assessment Scholars have become an essential part of the Center's efforts to use evidence to help institutions strengthen the impact of liberal arts education. Teagle Scholars provide support during meetings at the Center, at conferences and workshops, on site visits, and during brainstorming sessions via phone and email about how to support institutions.

Across these settings, the Teagle Scholars serve as problem solvers who, taking the culture, politics, and personalities within institutions into account, find ways to help those institutions use evidence to improve student learning. Since assessment data always points to many different “opportunities” for institutional improvement, the practical wisdom required of Teagle Assessment Scholars is to identify one or two opportunities that can be addressed at the moment given the political strength of the provost, the financial circumstances of the institution, the extent of trust between faculty and the administration, the profile of the institution's students, the specific programs that have or don't have political support, and so on.

When we first created the Teagle Assessment Scholar program, we imagined that these scholars would supplement the Center's efforts to help institutions develop high-quality assessment data. Our view of the world three years ago was that the primary impediment to the systematic improvement of student learning was the lack of dispositive evidence that would guide institutional improvement efforts.

Unfortunately, our assumption about the lack of high-quality evidence was completely wrong. Institutions have more than enough evidence at their disposal to identify changes that could improve student learning. One phenomenon that we've seen repeatedly in the Wabash National Study is that many faculty, staff, and administrators are surprised when they get back their results, even though the data replicates assessment findings they already have in hand.

Why does assessment data lie in the dark corners of an institution's cabinet? There are countless local reasons—the institutional researcher reports to the President and doesn't share results with people in academic affairs, the data have troubling implications and now is not a good time to create a problem, the only way to solve this problem is by hiring more faculty, our institution is unique and these findings about student experience don't apply, etc. But these local reasons are part of a larger "resistance to change" that seems to envelope college campuses. David Paris (Hamilton College) captured it best when he said that his work as a Teagle Scholar "reinforced his awe at the power of inertia on campuses."

We have to be honest—many faculty, staff, and administrators enjoy the structures, programs, buildings, and courses they've created and seek to preserve them. Changes implied by assessment data threaten the status quo. The face-to-face work in which the Center of Inquiry staff and Teagle Assessment Scholars engage has the potential to overcome this inertia because it identifies and creates strategies to move past the specific roadblocks on a campus. The fact that Teagle Assessment Scholars are outsiders often makes it easier for them to identify ways of navigating around those roadblocks than it is for campus insiders.

Looking forward

We come to the end of this grant with a topsy-turvy view of assessment compared with where we started. Whereas we once saw the Teagle Assessment Scholar Program as a support mechanism for the primary task of gathering good assessment evidence, we now
see our face-to-face work with institutions, helping them use assessment evidence, as the primary task. We also believe that evidence gathering is something better left to institutions and organizations such as HERI, NSSE, ETS, etc. We believe that the Center can most effectively meet its mission by refining our ability to move institutions to improve student learning. Furthermore, given the number of colleges and universities who are interested in the Center’s support, it is essential that we create a larger group of Teagle Assessment Scholars who can help our small staff meet this need. Finally, and in the broadest sense, the Center can only fulfill its mission if it creates a body of individuals who will carry on this important work long after the Center leaves the scene. In essence, we believe that the Center can have the largest and most long-lasting impact on higher education by building a self-sustaining pool of expertise and human capacity to help institutions change in response to evidence.

In June 2009, we hosted a meeting of a small group of Teagle Assessment Scholars, Jillian Kinzie (NSSE), and Donna Heiland (Teagle Foundation) to review a new version of the Wabash National Study—what we call WNSLAE 2.0. The new version of the study is different on three key points. First, it starts with a data audit to determine the assessment information that campuses already have. Second, the Center will move away from administering its own assessment instruments and focus instead on helping institutions utilize commonly used instruments and rubrics. Third, the main focus of the Center’s efforts will be on working with institutions to use evidence to make changes to improve student learning. Even our research will shift from examining how educational practices impact outcomes to examining the factors that promote institutional change in response to data. (See Appendix D for a description of WNSLAE 2.0.)

Given the importance of creating a larger network of Teagle Scholars, the next question is how do we transform the Center so that it becomes an assessment “teaching hospital”? Just as teaching hospitals focus simultaneously on providing medical care and education for medical practitioners, the Center must use the Wabash National Study and WNSLAE 2.0 to promote changes to improve student learning while at the same time creating a curriculum or sequence of experiences that helps to develop a larger and more proficient group of Teagle Scholars.

Training Teagle Assessment Scholars

Our very preliminary thoughts to date have focused on three areas for strengthening and expanding the Teagle Assessment Scholar network.

1) Developing new Teagle Assessment Scholars – We believe that there are two potential reservoirs of Teagle Assessment Scholars: faculty, staff, and administrators who have been assigned assessment or accreditation work by their institutions, and graduate students about to complete their Ph.D.’s in the arts and sciences. We’ve had success with these paths in the past—two current Teagle Scholars, Kyle Long and Autumn Harrell, are graduate students, and Tricia Seifert was in graduate school when she began in the TASP. We also have already identified several potential Teagle Scholars from these sources—for example, Susan Campbell, dean of faculty at Middlebury College, and Mark Salisbury, Ph.D. student at the University of Iowa. The Wabash Study Assessment Scholars are another group of potential Teagle Scholars. We’ve begun to imagine a year-long process in which these new scholars might learn and do the following:
   • Participate in a site visit or workshop as an observer.
   • Lead a session during a site visit or workshop.
• Attend workshops with other new Teagle Scholars on using and interpreting quantitative assessments such as NSSE, CLA, and MAPP; conducting helpful student interviews and focus groups; overviews of the standards of regional accreditors; and working with faculty from different disciplines on assessment.

2) **Continuing education for established Teagle Assessment Scholars** – The continuing education program would focus on two areas. First, creating opportunities for established Teagle Assessment Scholars to learn more about new trends, techniques, and approaches to assessment. Second, helping them develop their skills at leading single or multiple institutions in using evidence to improve student learning. Activities might include:

- Leading site visits or working with other Teagle Scholars to create workshops.
- Helping with the training of new Teagle Scholars.
- Attending workshops on new assessment techniques or tools, such as Tricia Seifert's session on regression and factor analysis at the May 2008 Teagle Scholar training meeting.
- Mining and evaluating data from Teagle Scholar/Center of Inquiry work with institutions.
- Training to lead individual or groups of institutions in multi-year assessment projects.

3) **Education for administrators and members of assessment/accreditation committees** – This is an area to which we have not devoted as much thought. However, we've learned that assessment can only make progress with the support of an institution's leaders. We also know that there are many administrators who are interested in using assessment information, but hesitate to do so because they are unsure about how to manage the process of creating formative public conversations and using limited resources effectively to follow up on those conversations. We believe that workshops to help develop these skills would help administrators use assessment information. Likewise, many different colleges and universities have now created assessment or accreditation committees. Unfortunately, these committees often consist of people with little or no assessment experience, and the committees themselves may not work effectively as a group. We believe that retreats and workshops for these committees may also play a useful role in creating a larger group of people in the academy who are familiar with best practices in assessment.

This is a very brief and incomplete overview, but our goal is to develop a more concrete version of these different "curricula" in the next 12 months.

**Next steps**

What "experiments" will we run to test out and solidify our ideas for how we can train a larger and more able group of Teagle Assessment Scholars? As we indicated above, one of our goals is to identify Teagle Assessment Scholars who are capable of and willing to lead assessment efforts with groups of institutions. Identifying such scholars is important both in terms of increasing the national level of assessment support "capital," and also in terms of developing the capacity of the Center to work with a larger number of institutions.

One way of organizing these groups of institutions is to form clusters, or nodes, of institutions that are located in the same area. A senior Teagle Assessment Scholar from an area could, with support from the Center, take responsibility for facilitating the assessment support efforts for the two or three institutions in that area. Working with institutions in the
same region should reduce some of the travel costs associated with making site visits and hosting workshops.

As a first step towards developing "node leaders" we ask for an unfunded extension of this grant to use the remaining funds (about $30,000, see Appendix E for the budget) to identify eight Teagle Assessment Scholars with whom we would work over the next year, training them to become leaders of groups of 2-3 institutions that are currently in the Wabash National Study. Although we may not be able to create the kinds of regional nodes at this point that we would aim for in our long-term planning, using the set of institutions that are currently engaged in the Wabash National Study provides an excellent opportunity for helping Teagle Scholars develop the skills of supporting assessment efforts at institutions, and could create the first cohort of scholars that would serve in regional nodes in WNSLAE 2.0.

We would begin contacting and working with these scholars in the next month, and propose to use the remaining funds to:

- cover their travel to institutions,
- provide low levels of administrative support for these scholars if necessary, and
- cover the costs of workshops and other training events over the next year.

The goal of this project would be to develop at least five Teagle Assessment Scholars who could lead nodes of institutions when WNSLAE 2.0 begins in August 2010. The "pilot work" over the next year with these Teagle Assessment Scholars would allow us to clarify, develop, and sequence the implementation of the three different Teagle Scholar training tracks that we described above, and mark the first step towards the educational program embedded in those tracks. We would be happy to develop a more precise budget for these activities if that would be helpful.
## APPENDIX A

### Teagle Assessment Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andersen, Catherine</td>
<td>Gallaudet University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd, Frank</td>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Deborah</td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss, Dan</td>
<td>Hamilton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christy, Jon</td>
<td>Luther College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cole, Darnell</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba, Lee</td>
<td>Wellesley College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freije, Margaret</td>
<td>College of Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garner, Tim</td>
<td>Franklin College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldey, Ellen</td>
<td>Wofford College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman-Garber, Deborah</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrell, Autumn</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long, Kyle</td>
<td>St. John's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottenhoff, John</td>
<td>Associated Colleges of the Midwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, David</td>
<td>Hamilton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips, Gary</td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reder, Michael</td>
<td>Connecticut College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schermer, Tim</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schodt, David</td>
<td>St. Olaf College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seifert, Tricia</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serlin, Bruce</td>
<td>DePauw University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sotherland, Paul</td>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Ann</td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trosset, Carol</td>
<td>Hampshire College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanderStoep, Scott</td>
<td>Hope College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VanWyk, Chris</td>
<td>Drew University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisler, Steve</td>
<td>Hampshire College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Wabash Study Assessment Scholars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Emerson</td>
<td>Salem State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Denise</td>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biles, Andrea</td>
<td>Worcester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom, Steven</td>
<td>Lasell College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colwell, Bruce</td>
<td>Carlton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson, Lori</td>
<td>Worcester State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodds, Richard</td>
<td>Lasell College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergerson, James</td>
<td>Carleton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, Maureen</td>
<td>Worcester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster-Clark, Frederick</td>
<td>Millersville University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galle, Jeffrey</td>
<td>Oxford College of Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubbins, James</td>
<td>Salem State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hornsby, Karen</td>
<td>North Carolina A &amp; T State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horton, Bobby</td>
<td>Wabash College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Nolan</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Dwyer, Anne</td>
<td>Bard College at Simon's Rock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orcutt, Bonnie</td>
<td>Worcester State College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nolan, Michael</td>
<td>Augustana College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riutta, Satu</td>
<td>Oxford College of Emory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roswarski, Todd</td>
<td>Ivy Tech Community College, Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shibley, Lisa</td>
<td>Millersville University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wen, Hui-Min</td>
<td>New College of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Jeanne</td>
<td>Ripon College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeek, Catherine</td>
<td>Lasell College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Retention Workshop
May 18–21, 2009

Workshop Goal
Institutional teams will develop specific action plans to address retention on their campus based on Wabash National Study and other institutional data.

Participant Information

- The dress for the workshop is casual. You should be prepared for both warm and cool buildings on campus. You might want to bring a light jacket or sweater. If you plan to join us for a hike at Pine Hills Nature Preserve on Wednesday afternoon, pack appropriate attire.
- Athletic facilities are available at the hotel and on campus each day.
- Shuttles between the conference hotel and campus will be available.
- There is coffee, tea, hot chocolate, and water available in the Trippet Hall beverage station outside of room 325 everyday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Monday, May 18, 2009

3:00 p.m. Meeting of Teagle scholars, presenters, and Center staff to plan for workshop
Trippet Hall 325

4:00 p.m. Shuttle from Hotel to Campus

4:00–5:00 p.m. Registration
- Pick up your conference packet if you haven’t already checked in
Outside Hays Science Hall 319

4:30–5:30 p.m. Opening session
- Welcome
- Introductions of Center staff, Teagle scholars, presenters, and participants
- Discussion of rationale and plan for workshop
Hays Science Hall 319

5:45–6:15 p.m. Reception
Trippet 2nd Floor Rotunda

6:15–7:45 p.m. Dinner
Trippet Dining Room

8:00–9:00 p.m. Plenary presentation by Tricia Seifert, University of Iowa
Hays Science Hall 319

Free time in evening
(Wine and beer are available in the Clifford lounge on the third floor of Trippet Hall for all participants.)

9:15–10:30 p.m. Van to hotel available
- There will be a student available at the front desk for transportation back to the hotel. The last shuttle will leave at 10:30 p.m.
Tuesday, May 19, 2009

7:30 a.m.  First shuttle from hotel
8:00 a.m.  Second shuttle from hotel
7:30–8:45 a.m.  Breakfast (full breakfast includes eggs, meat, oatmeal, etc.)  Trippet Dining Room
9:00–10:15 a.m.  Welcome by Patrick White, President of Wabash College, and plenary presentation by Mark Salisbury, University of Iowa  Hays Science Hall 319
10:15–10:30 a.m.  Break
10:30–12:00 p.m.  Data session – Each team can decide on their approach:
   • All team members can work with the WNS data set in SPSS, such as figuring out the best ways to address specific questions using individual level student data and doing some analysis related to retention—assisted by Tricia Seifert, Mark Salisbury, Sonia Ninon, and Anne Bost  Goodrich 101
   • All team members can work on reviewing and digesting WNS reports and other campus data reports relevant to retention—assisted by Teagle Scholars and CILA staff
   • Or you can split up your team and do both of the above
   • You can discuss these options with your Teagle Scholar to help figure out the best approach for your team
12:00–1:45 p.m.  Lunch  Trippet Dining Room
1:45–2:45 p.m.  Plenary Presentation by Carol Trosset, Hampshire College  Hays Science Hall 319
2:45–3:00 p.m.  Break
3:00–4:15 p.m.  Data session, continued
   • Again, each team can decide on their approach. Same options as the morning.  Goodrich 101 and same rooms from morning session
4:15–4:30 p.m.  Break  Trippet 2nd Floor Rotunda
4:30–6:15 p.m.  Institutional Team work time
   • Teams will be assisted by Teagle scholars
   • Teams will share information from morning data sessions and work on narrowing focus to certain data points
   • Teagle scholars will present action plan guidelines to teams, and teams will begin to work on their plans  Various locations*

*Trippet Hall 122, 220, 222, 312, and 325 are all available. There are also good options in the common areas of Trippet on the main and upper floors. You might also enjoy the front porch of Trippet Hall if the weather is nice. If you would like assistance finding a room for your institutional team to meet, please ask a Center of Inquiry staff member.
Tuesday, May 19, 2009, continued

6:30–8:00 p.m. Dinner
Dinner Trippet Dining Room

8:00 p.m. Meeting for staff, Teagle scholars, and presenters
Meeting for staff, Teagle scholars, and presenters Trippet 325

Free time in evening
(Wine and beer are available in the Clifford lounge on the third floor of Trippet Hall for all participants.)

8:15–10:30 p.m. Van to hotel available
- There will be a student available at the front desk for transportation back to the hotel. The last shuttle will leave at 10:30 p.m.

Wednesday, May 20, 2009

7:30 a.m. First shuttle from hotel
First shuttle from hotel

8:00 a.m. Second shuttle from hotel
Second shuttle from hotel

7:30–8:45 a.m. Breakfast (full, hot breakfast includes eggs, meat, oatmeal, etc.)
Breakfast Trippet Dining Room

9:00–10:00 a.m. Plenary presentation by Catherine Andersen, Gallaudet University
Plenary presentation by Catherine Andersen, Gallaudet University Hays Science Hall 319

10:00–10:15 a.m. Break
Break

10:15–12:15 p.m. Teams continue to work on institutional action plans
- Teams will be assisted by Teagle scholars
Teams continue to work on institutional action plans Various locations*

12:15–1:30 p.m. Lunch
Lunch Trippet Dining Room

1:30–2:30 p.m. Teams continue to work on institutional action plans
- Teams will be assisted by Teagle scholars
Teams continue to work on institutional action plans Various locations*

2:30–2:45 p.m. Break
Break

2:45–4:00 p.m. Institutional teams will share action plans in groups for feedback/critique
Institutional teams will share action plans in groups for feedback/critique Various locations*

4:00–4:30 p.m. Break/time to change clothes
- A van will be available for those staying at the hotel to make a quick trip to change clothes, if desired.
Break/time to change clothes Snacks available in Trippet 2nd floor rotunda

*Trippet Hall 122, 220, 222, 312, and 325 are all available. There are also good options in the common areas of Trippet on the main and upper floors. You might also enjoy the front porch of Trippet Hall if the weather is nice. If you would like assistance finding a room for your institutional team to meet, please ask a Center of Inquiry staff member.
**Wednesday, May 20, 2009, continued**

4:30 p.m. Depart Trippet Hall for off-campus excursions (*weather permitting*) or free time on campus
- Pine Hills Nature Preserve
  http://www.in.gov/dnr_old/naturepr/npdirectory/preserves/pinehills.html
- Old Jail Museum
  http://www.crawfordsville.org/museums.html

4:30–6:15 p.m. Free time to hike and explore the nature preserve; visit the museum; relax on campus, etc.

6:30 p.m. Depart from Pine Hills Nature Preserve

7:00–8:30 p.m. Picnic Dinner on Campus
  Caleb Mills House

Free time in evening
(Wine and beer are available in the Clifford lounge on the third floor of Trippet Hall for all participants.)

8:45–10:30 p.m. Van to hotel available
- There will be a student available at the front desk for transportation back to the hotel. The last shuttle will leave at 10:30 p.m.

**Thursday, May 21, 2008**

7:15 a.m. First shuttle from hotel
- Please bring your luggage to Trippet for storage until your departure

7:45 a.m. Second shuttle from hotel
- Please bring your luggage to Trippet for storage until your departure

7:30–8:30 a.m. Breakfast (full breakfast includes eggs, meat, oatmeal, etc.)
  Trippet Dining Room

8:45–9:45 a.m. Institutional teams finalize action plans
  Various locations*

9:45–10:00 a.m. Break

10:00–12:00 p.m. Institutional teams present action plans
  Hays Science Hall 319

12:00–1:00 p.m. Lunch
  Trippet Dining Room

12:30 p.m. Departures begin

1:00–2:00 p.m. Meeting of staff and available Teagle scholars and presenters
  Trippet 325

*Trippet Hall 122, 220, 222, 312, and 325 are all available. There are also good options in the common areas of Trippet on the main and upper floors. You might also enjoy the front porch of Trippet Hall if the weather is nice. If you would like assistance finding a room for your institutional team to meet, please ask a Center of Inquiry staff member.
Participants
Wabash National Study Retention Workshop
May 18–21, 2009

Butler University
Indianapolis, Indiana
Independent university composed of a college of liberal arts and sciences and four professional colleges; Butler’s mission is to integrate the liberal arts with professional education.
3,600 undergraduate students
www.butler.edu

- Jennifer Griggs, Director of the Learning Resource Center, jgriggs@butler.edu
- Kent Grumbles, Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, kgrumble@butler.edu
- Carol Hagans, Associate Provost for Student Academic Affairs, chagans@butler.edu

Coe College
Cedar Rapids, Iowa
Private liberal arts college focused on a personalized liberal arts education.
1,300 undergraduate students
www.coe.edu

- Lois Kabela-Coates, Assistant Dean of Student Retention Services and Director of Academic Achievement, lkabela@coe.edu
- Deanna Jobe, Dean of Student Retention Services, International Student Advisor, and Affirmative Action Officer, djobe@coe.edu
- Martin St. Clair, Associate Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Chemistry, mstclair@coe.edu

Columbia College
Columbia, South Carolina
Private liberal arts women's college related to the United Methodist Church that educates students in the liberal arts tradition.
1,240 undergraduate students
www.columbiasc.edu

- Laurie Hopkins, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs, lhopkins@columbiasc.edu
- Stephanie McNulty Kelley, Dean of Students, skelley@columbiasc.edu
- Erin Payseur, Center for Engaged Learning Program Coordinator, epayseur@columbiasc.edu
- Scott Smith, Registrar, Director of Institutional Research, and Dean of Curriculum and Assessment, scsmith@columbiasc.edu

1 Institutional information obtained from the US Department of Education’s Institute of Educational Sciences, National Center for Educational Statistics at http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/ and from institutional websites.
Connecticut College
New London, Connecticut
Private liberal arts college that educates students to put the liberal arts into action as citizens in a global society.
1,900 undergraduate students
www.conncoll.edu
- Martha Merrill, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, mcmerr@conncoll.edu
- John Nugent, Senior Research Analyst and Special Assistant to the President, jdnug@conncoll.edu
- Stuart Vyse, Professor of Psychology, savys@conncoll.edu

Hope College
Holland, Michigan
Private liberal arts college affiliated with the Reformed Church in America that educates students for lives of leadership and service in a global society.
3,325 undergraduate students
www.hope.edu
- Bill Reynolds, Dean of Arts and Humanities, reynolds@hope.edu
- Maura Reynolds, Director of Advising, mreynolds@hope.edu
- Pat Roehling, Professor of Psychology, roehling@hope.edu

Fairfield University
Fairfield, Connecticut
Private Jesuit university that educates the whole person – mind, body, and spirit.
4,050 undergraduate students
www.fairfield.edu
- Debnam Chappell, Dean of Freshmen and Professor of English, dchappell@mail.fairfield.edu
- Kathryn Nantz, Director of Core Integration and Professor of Economics, nantz@mail.fairfield.edu
- Ann Stehney, Assistant VP for Institutional Research and Planning, astehney@mail.fairfield.edu

North Carolina A&T State University
Greensboro, North Carolina
Public research university offering degree programs at the baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral levels, with emphasis on engineering, science, technology, and literature.
9,050 undergraduate students
www.ncat.edu
- Karen Hornsby, Liberal Studies Pre-Law Coordinator; Professor of Philosophy at North Carolina A&T State University, klhornsby@ncat.edu
- Alton Rucker, Institutional Researcher, alrucker@ncat.edu
- Scott Simkins, Director of the Academy for Teaching and Learning at North Carolina A&T State University, simkinss@ncat.edu
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, Indiana
Private, liberal arts college for men, and the home of the Center of Inquiry and the Wabash National Study
850 undergraduate students
www.wabash.edu

- Preston Bost, Professor of Psychology, bostp@wabash.edu
- Robert Horton, Professor of Psychology, hortonr@wabash.edu
- Cheryl Hughes, Associate Dean of the College, hughesc@wabash.edu
- Tim Lake, Director of the Malcolm X Institute of Black Studies, laket@wabash.edu
- Gary Phillips, Dean of the College, phillipg@wabash.edu
- Richard Warner, Professor of History and Acting Associate Dean of Students, warnerri@wabash.edu
- Patrick White, President of Wabash College, whitep@wabash.edu

Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College
The Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College collaborates with institutions to gather and use evidence to strengthen liberal arts education.
www.liberalarts.wabash.edu

- Charles Blaich, Director of Inquiries, charles.blaich@gmail.com
- Bill Doemel, Director of Operations, doemelb@wabash.edu
- Kathy Wise, Associate Director of Inquiries, kathywise@gmail.com
- Kelly McDorman, Coordinator of Inquiries, mcdormak@wabash.edu
- Libby Pinkerton, Communications Coordinator, pinkertl@wabash.edu
- Sonia Ninon, Research Analyst, ninons@wabash.edu
- Anne Bost, Research Fellow, bosta@wabash.edu
- Steve Weisler, Director, Wabash Teagle Assessment Scholars Program; Dean of Enrollment and Assessment at Hampshire College, sweisler@hampshire.edu

Wabash Teagle Assessment Scholars and Presenters
The scholars are faculty, staff, administrators, and researchers who have experience working on assessment. They work with the Center of Inquiry to assist institutions in using evidence to strengthen student learning.
www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/assessment

- Catherine Andersen, Associate Provost of Gallaudet University, Catherine.andersen@gallaudet.edu
- Frank Boyd, Associate Dean of the Faculty at Illinois Wesleyan University, fboyd@iwu.edu
- Michael Reder, Director of Connecticut College’s Center for Teaching & Learning, reder@conncoll.edu
- Mark Salisbury, Research Assistant and Doctoral Student at the University of Iowa, mark-salisbury@uiowa.edu
- Tricia Seifert, Postdoctoral Research Scholar with the Center for Research on Undergraduate Education at the University of Iowa, tricia-seifert@uiowa.edu
- Carol Trosset, Director of Institutional Research at Hampshire College, ctrosset@hampshire.edu
- Scott VanderStoep, Associate Professor and Chair of Psychology at Hope College, vanderstoep@hope.edu
**Issue description** – Describe one retention-related issue or problem that you hope to address in the next 12 months.

**Data that describe the issue:**

**Goals:**

Identify a specific, achievable long-term goal that helps address the issue. For example, “To achieve optimal undergraduate enrollment of 1,000 students by targeted retention of students.” or “To improve first-to-second-year retention rate to 85%.”

Identify a short-term outcome that can be achieved within the next academic year (by June 2010). This outcome can be thought of as a first step towards the long term goal identified above.
Key activities – Identify two alternative activities or initiatives to help you reach the short-term goal listed above. We have found that it is helpful to have at least two alternatives in case one option doesn’t gain campus support or doesn’t succeed. Examples might be to create a new early alert system or a faculty-student academic mentoring program for at-risk students.

Activity 1:

Activity 2:

Communication – To whom and how will you disseminate the data described above, your long-term and short-term goals, and your proposed activities at your institution?

We will contact you in June 2010 to ask about your institution’s progress on this plan.
Activity 1 – Detailed Plan

Do you need any additional data to implement this activity?

**Actions required** – Describe the specific actions, or the individual steps, required to implement this activity.

a. Actions:

b. What is the timeline for these actions?

c. Who will be responsible for these actions?
Activity 1 – Detailed Plan, continued

How will you know if this activity had an impact? What will be the measures or benchmarks of success?

Possible barriers to success:

Resources needed – What resources (include financial as well as time, etc.) will you need for this activity?

Communication – How will the purpose and results of this activity be communicated? What constituencies will be the target of these communication efforts?
Activity 2 – Detailed Plan

Do you need any additional data to implement this activity?

**Actions required** – Describe the specific actions, or the individual steps, required to implement this activity.

a. Actions:

b. What is the timeline for these actions?

c. Who will be responsible for these actions?
Activity 2 – Detailed Plan, continued

How will you know if this activity had an impact? What will be the measures or benchmarks of success?

Possible barriers to success:

Resources needed – What resources (include financial as well as time, etc.) will you need for this activity?

Communication – How will the purpose and results of this activity be communicated? What constituencies will be the target of these communication efforts?
### APPENDIX C

Teagle Assessment Scholar Activities, August 2008-July 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activity/event</th>
<th>Staff/Teagle Scholars/WSAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 6-8, 2008</td>
<td>Orientation Meeting for representatives from 2008 cohort of WNS institutions</td>
<td>David Paris, Carol Trosset, Frank Boyd, Michael Reder, Steve Weisler, Bruce Serlin, John Ottenhoff, Kyle Long, all Center staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 13-15, 2008</td>
<td>Orientation Meeting for representatives from 2008 cohort of WNS institutions</td>
<td>Steve Weisler, Jon Christy, Paul Sotherland, Ann Taylor, David Schodt, Tricia Seifert, all Center staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 2008</td>
<td>Hope College, presentation at Pre-College Conference</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 26-28, 2008</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College visit to discuss WNSLAE data at Faculty Development Day</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Kathy Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13-14, 2008</td>
<td>Visit to NCA&amp;T to observe their Wabash/Provost Scholars Focus Group Training Workshop</td>
<td>Lee Cuba, Charlie Blaich, and Kathy Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 17-19, 2008</td>
<td>Worcester State College and Worcester Polytechnic Institute visit to discuss Wabash National Study</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Steve Weisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23-24, 2008</td>
<td>Warren Wilson College visit to discuss Wabash National Study</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Steve Weisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 24-26, 2008</td>
<td>NCA&amp;T Visit to discuss Wabash National Study data</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Autumn Harrell, and Scott VanderStoep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3-4, 2008</td>
<td>Southwestern University visit to lead faculty development workshop</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16-18, 2008</td>
<td>AAC&amp;U Diversity, Learning, and Inclusive Excellence Conference, conducted data workshop</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, Steve Weisler, and Autumn Harrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23-24, 2008</td>
<td>Augustana College visit to discuss Wabash National Study</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 29-30, 2008</td>
<td>PKAL Meeting, assist in creating program to help institutions assess the impact of Keck/PKAL grants</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12-13, 2008</td>
<td>Hampshire College site visit; follow-up on WNS</td>
<td>Frank Boyd and Deborah Grossman-Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Activity/event</td>
<td>Staff/Teagle Scholars/WSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 13-14, 2008</td>
<td>Hampshire College visit to evaluate college’s Center for Teaching</td>
<td>Frank Boyd and David Schodt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16-18, 2008</td>
<td>Visit to Ripon College to discuss Wabash National Study</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, and Bruce Colwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20-21, 2008</td>
<td>Teagle Board Meeting</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 24-25, 2008</td>
<td>Visit to Middlebury College</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Steve Weisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 3-5, 2008</td>
<td>New England Association of Schools &amp; Colleges (NEASC) 123rd Annual Meeting and Conference, conducted data workshop</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Steve Weisler, Kathy Wise, Michael Reder, and Deborah Grossman-Garber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11-12, 2008</td>
<td>Amherst College visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 6, 2009</td>
<td>Meeting at Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13-14, 2009</td>
<td>Gallaudet University visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27-28, 2009</td>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute visit to judge projects</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 4-6, 2009</td>
<td>Kalamazoo College Visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Kathy Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10-12, 2009</td>
<td>Bucknell University visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16-18, 2009</td>
<td>Middlebury College visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Steve Weisler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23-25, 2009</td>
<td>Fairfield University visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, Steve Weisler, and Satu Riutta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6-8, 2009</td>
<td>SoTL Conference</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, Steve Weisler, Carol Trosset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9-13, 2009</td>
<td>Marlboro College Visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, and Richard Dodds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24-26, 2009</td>
<td>Allegheny College visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy, Wise, Jon Christy, and Susan Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29-31, 2009</td>
<td>Hampshire Teagle Consortium Meeting</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, Steve Weisler, John Ottenhoff, Deborah Grossman-Garber, Michael Reder, Catherine Andersen, David Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1-April 3, 2009</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island and Community College of Rhode Island Visits</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, and Jeff Galle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7-9, 2009</td>
<td>New College of Florida Visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Kathy Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 13-15, 2009</td>
<td>Carleton College visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, and Carol Trosset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20-22, 2009</td>
<td>Franklin College visit</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, and Todd Roswarski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Activity/event</td>
<td>Staff/Teagle Scholars/WSAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18-21, 2009</td>
<td>WNS Retention Workshop</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, all Center Staff, Steve Weisler, Tricia Seifert, Catherine Anderson, Carol Trosset, Scott VanderStoep, Frank Boyd, Jon Christy, and Michael Reder; also Mark Salisbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 27-29, 2009</td>
<td>Teagle Collaborative Workshop at McDaniel College</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich and Kathy Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31-June 2, 2009</td>
<td>AAC&amp;U Institute on General Education, presentation on assessing new general education programs</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 2009</td>
<td>Online Data conference with URI</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, Kelly McDorman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8-10, 2009</td>
<td>Exploring WNSLAE 2.0 Meeting</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Kathy Wise, David Schodt, Catherine Andersen, Frank Boyd, Jon Christy, and David Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17-19, 2009</td>
<td>Transformative Models of Higher Education meeting hosted by Emory University</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 23, 2009</td>
<td>Online Data conference with URI</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich, Sonia Ninon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 29-31, 2009</td>
<td>PKAL Summer Institute, help institutions develop assessment plans for interdisciplinary science projects</td>
<td>Charlie Blaich</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The new version of the Wabash National Study

For the last four years, the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNSLAE) has been the primary mechanism by which the Center of Inquiry has implemented its mission to collaborate with institutions to gather and use evidence to strengthen liberal arts education. After three years, 49 institutions, more than 17,000 students, and 20 plus major research publications, it is time to revise the study. Our reason for doing so is not based on diminished demand nor a shift in the Center of Inquiry's mission. Our mission remains the same and we are confident that we could add at least 20 new schools to the study for the next two to three years. Rather, it is time to revise the study because our experience has taught us that we can design a process that will have a greater impact on improving student learning at a far lower cost than the current study.

We have learned two basic lessons over the last three years. First, that the study would have greater institutional benefit if it included authentic student work, in addition to surveys and tests that are commonly used by colleges and universities to meet accreditation and accountability standards. Second, more than any of the tests and surveys, the most effective component of the Wabash Study is the ongoing collaboration between the Center of Inquiry and campus representatives via visits, meetings, conference calls, and other interactions that are designed to help institutions make good use of their assessment data. The next version of the Wabash National Study is designed to incorporate both of these lessons.

The following document contains a preliminary description of the revised Wabash National Study (WNSLAE-2). We are still setting up our connections with some of the survey and testing organizations that we hope to collaborate with, so some of the details we describe below may change over the next few months. Nonetheless, the basic structures described here will remain intact.

Structure of WNSLAE-2

The goal of WNSLAE-2 is to:

1. help institutions gather and evaluate evidence about student learning;
2. use that evidence to identify and make changes that enhance student learning
3. assess the impact of those changes; and
4. create processes and infrastructures for improving student learning that institutions can continue to draw upon after the study's conclusion.

Like the first version of the Wabash Study, WNSLAE-2 is a multi-year project designed to assess three important qualities:

- **Inputs** - the attitudes and values that students bring into college
- **Experiences** - the experiences that impact students once they are in college
- **Outcomes** - the impact that college has on student ability and knowledge

In the first version of the Wabash Study we used an extensive battery of surveys and standardized tests. To improve the ease of administering the study, WNSLAE-2 incorporates a smaller number of commonly used surveys and outcome measures. We will also use rubrics to evaluate student work in WNSLAE-2 in order to better connect the study to papers, projects, and other assignments that faculty and staff regularly ask students to complete.
The following are the surveys, rubrics, and instruments that we plan to use:

- **Inputs**
  - The Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey, administered by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI)
  - Additional questions from the Wabash National Study Incoming Student Survey
  - Information from institutions, such as:
    - SAT/ACT scores
    - State and federal financial aid eligibility
    - High school class rank

- **Experiences**
  - National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
  - Wabash National Study Student Experiences Survey

- **Outcomes**
  - AAC&U VALUE rubrics
    - All institutions will use two rubrics: the AAC&U VALUE rubric for critical thinking and another AAC&U VALUE rubric of the institution's choice.
    - See [AAC&U VALUE rubrics](#)
  - Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) critical thinking and writing essay tests, or the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test.
    - Institutions would test their first- and fourth-year students
  - Institutions may choose to add additional outcome measures from the original version of the Wabash Study (e.g., Socially Responsible Leadership Scale, Ryff Scales of Psychological Well-Being, Defining Issues Test, Need for Cognition Scale)

In addition to using these measures, WNSLAE-2 includes a structured process that is designed to help faculty, staff, students, and administrators:

1. evaluate the results of these measures, as well as data from previously collected assessment information;
2. identify specific institutional, course, and program elements they would like to strengthen; and
3. develop, implement, and assess strategies for strengthening these institutional elements.

We plan to accomplish this through a series of site visits, meetings, and workshops that we developed in the first round of the Wabash Study. These activities are staffed by the Director and Associate Director of the Center of Inquiry and Teagle Assessment Scholars. Teagle Scholars include faculty and administrators from institutions across the country with expertise in assessment and institutional improvement.

Like previous versions of the Wabash National Study, WNSLAE-2 will emphasize within and across institution collaboration. We will not benchmark or make public comparisons of institutions. Institutions are free to communicate the information they develop from the study as they choose, as long as they do not identify other institutions.
WNSLAE-2 Timeline

Fall 2009
• Institutions apply to join Wabash National Study

December 2009
• The Center of Inquiry selects participating institutions

Spring 2010
• Center of Inquiry staff work with institutions to catalog assessment data they already possess
• Teams of Center of Inquiry staff and Teagle Scholars begin visiting institutions to meet with campus representatives

Fall 2010
• Representatives from Wabash Study institutions participate in a kick-off meeting at Wabash College
• Center of Inquiry staff and Teagle Scholars continue visits to study institutions to meet with campus representatives
• Institutions administer the CIRP Freshman Survey
• Institutions begin to collect 1st & 4th year student papers

Spring 2011
• Institutions administer NSSE and CAAP, MAPP, or CLA

Summer 2011
• Workshops at institutions to apply rubrics to student work

Fall 2011
• Site visits from Center of Inquiry staff and Teagle Scholars to collaborate with faculty, staff, administrators, and students to evaluate evidence collected in the first year of the study.
  • Discussions could include merging data from different sources, mining data for patterns and trends, and conducting student focus groups or interviews to follow-up on qualitative data.
  • The goal of this evaluation will be to use the evidence to identify specific educational practices and experiences that impact student learning at the institution, as well as to identify groups of students who have high and low levels of these experiences.

Spring 2012
• Workshops, either regionally or at the Center of Inquiry, to teach campus representatives various tools they can use at their institutions to collaborate with colleagues to respond to assessment data.
• Campus representatives from Center-sponsored workshops help their institutions develop and conduct retreats, workshops, and other activities to teach faculty and staff how to translate assessment findings to classrooms and programs and develop action plans for change.
Summer 2012
- Institutions continue retreats, workshops, etc. to help faculty and staff translate assessment findings to classrooms and programs and develop action plans for change.

Fall 2012 and Spring 2013
- Faculty and staff implement changes in their classes and programs based on the assessment findings in order to improve student learning.
- Administer short classroom and program surveys to measure the impact of classroom and program changes.

June 2013
- Final meeting, either regionally or at the Center of Inquiry, to review the changes that made a difference at institutions and discuss how institutions will continue to gather, evaluate, and use assessment data to improve student learning.

Costs
Institutions will cover the following costs:
- CIRP, NSSE, and CLA, CAAP, or MAPP test
- Gathering student documents and evaluating them using rubrics
- Travel to Center-sponsored meetings identified in the timeline
- Lodging and meals for site visit teams
- Commit to allocating $10,000 for responding to the assessment evidence gathered in the study
  - These are dollars that the institution will "pay itself" to cover the costs of faculty development workshops, institutional meetings or retreats to review the data, follow-up student interviews, or any other institutional activity that helps the institution respond formatively to the assessment data.

The Center of Inquiry will cover the following costs:
- Travel to and from institutions for site visits
- Food and lodging for participants at Center-sponsored meetings identified in the timeline
- Teagle Scholar stipends and all other consulting costs