Meta-Assessment Rubric
for Evaluating Assessment Plans

The meta-assessment rubric is a tool for evaluating and enhancing the quality of an assessment plan. It does not evaluate student performance or the program or department itself.

Instructions for using the rubric:
- Type the name of the program/unit and the assessment cycle being evaluated (e.g., 2021-2022).
- Read the descriptions in the first column to gain an understanding of what the ideal plan item should include, along with any notes.
- Use the information in the remaining columns to identify whether each part of the assessment plan is *developing*, *minimally compliant*, *good*, or *exemplary*, and select the appropriate rating. This is a holistic rating of each plan item type.
- Provide qualitative feedback in each *Reviewer Feedback* box. This will assist the program/unit in identifying specific areas for improvement. Be sure to also point out what the program/unit is doing well.
- After evaluating each plan area, on the last page of the document, select an overall rating and provide general feedback.

Please note:
- It is possible for any unit to have both learning objectives (LO) and performance objectives (PO). However, academic programs (degree, certificate, minor) must include learning objectives, and they typically have no performance objectives. All other units must include performance objectives.
- Learning objectives must have related *indicators*, *criteria*, and *findings*.
- Performance objectives must have related *key performance indicators* (*KPIs)*, *targets*, and *results*.

Office of Assessment
SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Meta-Assessment Rubric
for Evaluating Assessment Plans

Program/Unit Name: Management Information Systems, BBA

Assessment Cycle: 2022-23

Goals
Broad statements of mission or purpose that serve as the guiding principle of a unit.

Goals should ideally:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	☑ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Broadly state the intentions, aspirations, or ambitions of the unit • Address the larger impact of the unit	• None entered	• Goal(s) are stated, but they are generally unclear	• Goal(s) are clearly stated	• More than one goal entered • All goals are clearly stated • Goals address the full purpose of unit according to the course catalog

Goals should ideally:
• Broadly state the intentions, aspirations, or ambitions of the unit
• Address the larger impact of the unit

Note:
• Goals are not necessarily directly measurable.
• Although there is no minimum number of goals, plans should have more than one goal.
• The number of goals should be appropriate for the size of the unit.

Reviewer Feedback

Overall goal is provided, but it is overly broad and there is only one specified.

Objectives

Specific, detailed, and measurable statements of the expected knowledge, skills, or abilities gained as a result of receiving instruction or training, or of the expected attainment of non-learning tasks.

Objectives should:	☐ Developing	☑ Minimally Compliant	☐ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Clearly align with goals • Isolate one behavior or service • Articulate the knowledge, skills, or abilities gained or demonstrated (LO) • Describe the desired quality or improvement of services (PO) • Use precise, measurable, and observable verbs (e.g., analyze, create, identify, solve) instead of verbs that are not observable (e.g., understand, know, be familiar with) **Notes:** • Learning objectives (LO) are required by academic programs. • Performance objectives (PO) are required by all others. • All units may have both LO and PO. • Each goal should be supported by more than one objective.	• None entered; or • None fully address specifications for an objective	• At least one addresses all specifications	• Most address all specifications	• More than one objective per goal • All address all specifications

Reviewer Feedback

The LOs are directly related to student learning. It appears that they have made an effort to describe what their majors need to be successful. However, the LOs are not described in precise and measurable terms, mainly using phrases such as "demonstrate an understanding".

3

Indicators and/or KPIs

The methods, instruments, processes, or techniques used to measure and evaluate learning or performance objectives; the means of gathering data. Learning objectives will have indicators, and performance objectives will have KPIs (Key Performance Indicators).

Indicators/KPIs should describe:
- The source of data (e.g., exam scores, survey data, etc.)
- How data is gathered, by whom, and from whom
- When or how often data will be gathered
- Who will evaluate or score the item(s)
- The rubric or evaluation scale (e.g., %, 0-5, pass/fail, Likert scale, etc.)
- Who will review the results and when they will be reviewed

Indicators/KPIs should:
- Clearly align with objectives
- Include both direct and indirect measures, with an emphasis on direct measures
- Clearly show how they can provide data for improving learning and performance

Notes:
- Direct measures assess actual learning or performance, while indirect measures imply that learning or performance improvement has occurred.
- Specific instruments may be attached as supporting documentation, when appropriate.
- Each objective should be supported by more than one indicator/KPI.

☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	☑ Good	☐ Exemplary
• None entered; or • All are lacking many details to address specifications for an indicator/KPI • No direct measures included	• At least one addresses most specifications • At least one direct measure included	• Most address most specifications • Most measures used are direct	• All address most specifications • More than one indicator/KPI per objective • Mix of direct and indirect measures used for each objective

Reviewer Feedback

The indicators are clear and concise. Each criterion provide measurable standards for assessment purposes. And although this is somewhat referenced in the Update to the PCI, it is not clear what schedule is used to assess which individual LOs in any given year.

4

Criteria/Targets

The benchmark, value, or result that will represent success at achieving a learning or performance objective.
Indicators will have criteria, and KPIs will have targets.

Criteria/Targets should:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	☑ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Align with indicators/KPIs and objectives • Be measurable and quantifiable (e.g., an increase of 5%) • Represent a feasible or reasonable amount of success (ambitious but attainable) • Contain specific contextual information to explain how the criteria/targets for success were selected and were appropriate for the objectives (e.g., specific benchmarks, accepted standards, past results)	• None entered; or • None fully address specifications for a criterion/target	• At least one criterion/target addresses all specifications	• Criteria/targets are included for all indicators or KPIs • Most address all specifications	• Criteria/targets are included for all indicators or KPIs • All address all specifications

Reviewer Feedback

Overall the targets align with the LOs and are measurable/quantifiable. However, there is some confusing and conflicting language that refers to class averages being used to in assessing competency standards being met, not number/percentage of students meeting those standards.

Findings/Results

A clear and concise summary of the results gathered from the assessment indicators and/or KPIs.

Findings/results should:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	☑ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Align with the corresponding target for success • Be concise and well-organized • Provide actionable data that can clearly be used for improvement • Compare new findings to past trends, previous results, and/or existing standards as appropriate • Provide a clear explanation that targets were met, partially met, or not met • Include supporting documentation, if applicable (e.g., completed rubrics, survey results) **Notes:** • It is okay if a criterion/target is not met. This just provides an opportunity for future improvement. • Be sure to anonymize all data submitted.	• None entered; or • All are lacking many details to address specifications for a finding/result	• At least one addresses most specifications • At least one aligns with the target for success and clearly indicates if target was met	• Most address most specifications • Most align with the targets for success and clearly indicate if targets were met	• All address most specifications • All align with the targets for success and clearly indicate if targets were met

Reviewer Feedback

The findings (it appears there were two LOs assessed this year) are detailed and provide data on student progress in meeting the LOs. The findings break down the student success data by excellent (or exceeds), good (meets), and poor (falls below expected standard). The findings provide data by which the program can make recommendations for program modifications.

Actions
Specific steps taken to improve a program or unit based on analysis of the assessment findings and/or KPI results.

Actions should:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	☑ Good	☐ Exemplary
- Clearly follow from assessment findings/results - Identify an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced - Define logical "next steps" - Identify a responsible person or group - Contain completion dates **Or** explain why a finding/result will not be assessed in the future	- None entered; or - None fully address specifications for a finding/result; or - All actions focus on continuing current processes or increasing targets or specifications	At least one addresses most specifications	Most address most specifications	All address most specifications

Actions should: (continued)

- **Or** explain why a finding/result will not be assessed in the future

Notes:
- This item is in future tense. It should only include what the unit will do in the next cycle.
- It's okay if some, but not all, actions identify an area of the assessment process that needs improvement (e.g., only changing the indicator or criterion).
- Actions related to learning objectives should be mostly focused on pedagogical and/or curricular changes to affect student learning.

Reviewer Feedback

There were actions for improving outcomes for the two LOs assessed during the year. They may be a broad in scope so additional specificity of those the actions would be welcome.

PCI Update

The narrative updating the unit's relative progress in completing the previous cycle's plan for continuous improvement (PCI).

The PCI Update should:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	✔ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Be specific and detailed • Provide a progress update, with relevant contextual information, for all items discussed in the previous cycle's PCI • Clarify whether items in the previous PCI were completed or not, and to what extent **Note:** • The PCI update should be in past tense. • This rating of this item is dependent on the quality of the previous cycle's PCI. • Mark N/A in notes section and do not select a rating if this was a **new unit** for the year being reviewed. New units will not have a previous PCI.	• Not entered; or • Does not address any items from the previous PCI	• Does not address all items from previous PCI; or • May fully address previous PCI, but information in previous PCI was limited	• Addresses all items from previous PCI • Previous PCI was adequate • Provides general detail (lacks some specificity)	• Addresses all items from previous PCI • Previous PCI was robust • Provides specific detail (who, what, when, where, why)

Reviewer Feedback

The update to the previous cycle's plan provided detailed updates on areas discussed in the previous PCI. However, the previous PCI focused more on changes in the assessment plan (e.g., scheduling issues) than activities related to improving student learning.

New PCI

The narrative summarizing all actions to be implemented into one coherent plan.

The New PCI should:	☐ Developing	☐ Minimally Compliant	✔ Good	☐ Exemplary
• Be specific and detailed • Include a summary of all identified actions found within the current plan • Include any new initiatives or other items that will be assessed in the next cycle • Provide additional contextual information or details about what the actions are, how and when they will be implemented, and who will be responsible **Notes:** • The New PCI should be in future tense. • The New PCI should represent all the unit's intended actions that will be assessed for the following cycle.	• Not entered; or • Does not address any actions from the current plan	• Does not include all actions from the current plan	• Includes all actions from the current plan • Provides general detail (lacks some specificity)	• Includes all actions from the current plan • Provides specific detail (who, what, when, where, why)

Reviewer Feedback

A summary is provided, including some specific actions to be taken. I would prefer to see additional context that summarizes how these actions are related to LOs and the results of LO assessments. More internships, certifications, and ACE courses are all good things but it would be better to show how these are related to the degree LOs.

Overall Rating

Please select an overall rating for the assessment plan.

Developing	Minimally Compliant	✔ Good	Exemplary

Reviewer Feedback

Overall the assessment plan is sound with sufficient details about what is being done, the results of the assessments, and actions stemming from the assessments. The PCI should more specifically address actions to be taken (or more clearly explain how those actions) are designed to improve student learning.