

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

This rubric is used to evaluate assessment processes and reports for Academic, Division of Student Development and Success (DSDS), Operational, and Administrative units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC). The reviewer will reference the **performance descriptors** (across four **performance levels**) below for each of the **eight rubric criteria**, when evaluating unit processes and reports. Remember that some program assessment plans were substantively developed prior to the use of this rubric; specific processes and reports may differ from requested criteria below.

The reviewer will utilize language from this rubric to describe the rating for each of the **eight criteria** and give consideration to both qualitative and quantitative approaches to planning and assessment. The reviewer will also provide comments and suggestions, recognize improvement plans, and provide considerations for next steps. Below is a diagram of the rubric's components. There is also a **glossary of terms** starting on page 11 of this document. This rubric was developed by UDC's University Assessment Council in 2015-2016, and updated in spring 2019 by the Director of Institutional Assessment and Outcomes.

Performance Levels

	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
Criteria Criterion Brief criterion definition here	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance descriptor 			
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Vision Statement</p> <p>A clear, concise, and aspirational statement of what the unit will look like when it is achieving its mission. Please note: a vision statement is not required for all programs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (roughly 10 words) • Feasible • Inspirational (reflects core values) and aspirational (future-oriented) • Identifies stakeholders • Connects with the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise • Feasible • Identifies stakeholders • Connects with the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement is provided, but it is not clear or concise • Does not identify stakeholders • Does not demonstrate clear connection with missions of the unit(s) and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No vision statement is provided
<p>Comments</p>				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Mission Statement</p> <p>A concise statement that clarifies the vision statement, describes the purpose and function of the program, and provides a basis for creating goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (between 50 and 100 words) • Clarifies the vision statement and has a long-term focus • Describes primary functions of the unit (what the unit does and how it does it, e.g., activities) • Includes purpose specific to unit (the “why”) • Distinguishes unit from other units at UDC • Identifies stakeholders (and recognizes their needs) • Uses language that aligns with goals • Connected with the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise • The unit’s functions are provided, but the statement is somewhat limited in description of activities • Identifies stakeholders • Uses language that aligns with goals • Connected with the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statement is too general to distinguish from other units or too specific to encompass the overall intent of the unit • Identifies functions performed in a very limited manner • Does not identify stakeholders • Does not demonstrate clear connection to mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mission statement is provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports
Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Goals</p> <p>Broad statements on cross-cutting skills that inform the work the unit engages in over time. Operational goals (e.g., retention, service, satisfaction) are equally critical to a unit’s success.</p> <p><i>Note: Align program & unit goals to staff S.M.A.R.T. Goals via Human Resource’s Performance Management Process</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-5 broad, clear goals that focus on cross-cutting skills—learned over time • Skills describe desired performance of a unit (that align with unit activities/deliverables) • Operational goals are aligned with desired benchmarks/targets • Connected to the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole • Focused on benefitting recipients of the service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 statements on skills that are learned over time • Described as desired performance of a unit • Connected to the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part • Focused on benefitting recipients of the service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goals are stated but they are generally unclear and/or not “cross-cutting” • Focus is on current unit processes rather than ongoing, desired performance of the unit • Not written to benefit the recipients of the service • Does not demonstrate clear connection to mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No goals are stated
<p>Comments</p>				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Objectives</p> <p>Specific statements that describe future performance on cross-cutting skills. Objectives are the measurable and observable equivalent to goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-5 objectives that are specific, measurable, and observable • Each objective is clearly linked to stated goals (and aligned with activities/deliverables) • Written in future tense—as ongoing, desired end results for stakeholders • Connected to the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 objectives that are specific, measurable, and observable • Connected to the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part • Language is well-suited to the aligned goal(s), but somewhat vague or needs revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one-half (50%) of the objectives are incompletely stated, e.g., not specific, measurable, or linked to goals • Does not demonstrate clear connection to the mission(s) of the unit and division of which it is a part, and of the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objectives are stated
<p>Comments</p>				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Measures of Assessment (Activities and Assessment Methods)</p> <p>A variety of activities/ assignments and methods (qualitative and quantitative; direct and indirect; formative and summative; diagnostic) is used to evaluate each intended goal and objective; provides clear information on the means of gathering data. Often discussed as “tools” or “instruments.”</p> <p><i>*Ideally, measures provide both valid and reliable data.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both direct and indirect measures* are used throughout, with an emphasis on direct measures • Multiple and mixed methods are used for some or all objectives • Described with ample detail (units may include supporting documentation, e.g., assignments, projects, or workshop descriptions & methods used to assess these activities, such as rubrics or surveys) • Feasible – existing practices are used where possible • Clearly aligned with goals and objectives • Purposeful – it is clear how measures will be used for unit success 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both direct and indirect measures are used across the unit’s plan • At least one method is used for each objective • Described with sufficient detail • Clearly aligned with goals and objectives • Purpose of measures are not verifiable or clear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No direct measures are used • Methods are identified for some, but not all, objectives • Some measures are not clearly aligned with goals and objectives • Measures are described in vague terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No measures of assessment are provided or insufficient detail is provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Benchmarks/ Targets</p> <p>Benchmarks are numerical reference points that are used for measuring or comparing current performance against standards that adopt best practices. Targets are projected figures based on previous results or existing standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmarks and/or targets are identified for each assessment activity • Aligned with intended goals and objectives • Measurable and quantifiable (e.g., an increase of 5%) and represents a feasible/reasonable amount of success • Targets are based on previous results and/or existing standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmarks and/or targets are identified for some or most assessment activities • Aligned with intended goals and objectives • Measurable and quantifiable (e.g., an increase of 5%) and represent a feasible/reasonable amount of success • Targets appear arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benchmarks and/or targets are limited and/or not aligned with the activities • Language used to describe the benchmarks are vague or subjective (e.g., “improve,” “satisfactory”) • No quantifiable targets, or where targets do exist—they appear too low/too high and have no connection with previous results and/or existing standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No benchmarks or targets are identified
<p>Comments</p>				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Analysis/Results</p> <p>A complete, concise analysis and summary of the data/findings gathered from each given assessment measure.</p> <p><i>*All documentation must be anonymized</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete, concise, and well-organized • Evidence of appropriate data collection (data is quantitative and qualitative) and analysis (e.g., charts, graphs, reflections, and descriptions) • Address whether goals and objectives were met, partially met, or not met • Includes the date that results were entered • Compares new findings to past trends, previous results and/or existing standards as appropriate • Includes supporting documentation, where necessary* (e.g., previous and current data from activities for comparison) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete and organized • Evidence of data collection/analysis • Addresses whether goals and objectives were met • Addresses benchmarks/targets • May contain too much information or stray slightly from the data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete or too much information • Not clearly aligned with goals and objectives • Questionable/unclear or lack of conclusion about whether benchmarks/targets were met, partially met, or not met • Questionable collection/analysis that is inattentive to the data as conclusions were drawn 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis/results are provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Actions for Continuous Improvement</p> <p>Actions describe improvements to the program or assessment processes based on analysis of results. The assessment findings feature improvements <i>and</i> demonstrated effectiveness/success, and the subsequent report is shared widely with stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least 3 actions in the improvement plan • Addresses goals & demonstrates success • Clearly describes how specific results will be used to modify objectives, activities, planning, resource allocation, work methods, assessment strategies, etc. and/or clearly identifies areas for monitoring, remediation, or enhancement; defines next steps, where applicable • Includes clear timeframe for implementing actions/ determining follow-up • Identifies a responsible person/group • Clearly describes how results will be shared with/distributed to stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies at least 1 action in the improvement plan • Describes with some detail how results will be used to modify objectives, activities, planning, resource allocation, work methods, assessment strategies, etc. and/or identifies areas for monitoring, remediation, or enhancement; provides some next steps, where applicable • Includes a timeframe • Identifies a responsible person/group 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Action plan is not clearly related to assessment results • Doesn't address results appropriately and/or lacks next steps for systematic program improvement • Too general; not enough detail provided (e.g. timeframe, responsible person/group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actions for continuous improvement are not provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Meta-Rubric Adapted from the Following References:

Andrews University (2015). "Rubric for Evaluating Program Assessment Plan."

<https://www.andrews.edu/services/effectiveness/assessment/resources/andrews-rubric-for-evaluating-program-assessment-plans-and-reports-v.2.docx>

Texas A&M University. (2014). "Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports."

http://assessment.tamu.edu/assessment/media/Weave-Support-Documents/Assessment-Review-Rubric_1.pdf

Wayne State University. (2018). "WSU Assessment Plan Feedback Rubric."

https://wayne.edu/assessment/files/ws_u_program_assessment_plan_feedback_rubric.docx

References on Rubric Components:

<https://www.aacu.org/parts-value-rubric>

<https://www.uow.edu.au/curriculum-transformation/aqc/components/index.html>

See next page for a glossary of terms...

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Glossary of Terms

Assessment Activities (connect with “Assessment Methods”)

Activities and assignments are used to collect assessment data, when evaluating goals and objectives. Examples of activities and assignments include: **direct measures** using **formative** approaches (e.g., discussions, group work, polling, minute papers, and check-ins) and **summative** approaches (e.g., case studies, papers, presentations, and projects); national certifications, licensure, or professional exams; portfolios. Include supporting documents, in addition to the descriptions of your activities/assignments, in your reporting.

Assessment Methods (connect with “Assessment Activities”)

Assessment methods are used to analyze your assessment data, when evaluating goals and objectives. Examples of assessment methods include: capstone projects; checklists; e-portfolios; evaluations from site supervisors; **indirect measures** (e.g., course evaluations, focus groups, interviews, peer feedback, and surveys); pre- and post-tests; ratings scales; rubrics. Include supporting documents, in addition to the descriptions of your assessment methods, in your reporting.

Benchmarks (connect with “Baseline Data” and “Targets”)

Benchmarks are numerical reference points that are used for measuring or comparing current performance against standards that adopt best practices. Benchmarks are informed by existing data from peer units, institutions, organizations, etc., to support assessment processes that are suitable to your unit and aimed at continuous improvement.

Texas A&M University. 2014. [“Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports.”](#)

University of Virginia. [“Benchmarking in Higher Education.”](#)

Continuous Improvement

Continuous improvement is a process that focuses on implementing continual, yet incremental, changes to enhance courses, programs, services, and offerings based on goals and objectives. Continuous improvement in higher education relies on *assessment practices that have been proven to provide valid and reliable data*, and typically uses a cyclical approach. See [UDC’s Cycle of Continuous Improvement](#) for an example of a cyclical approach to assessment.

Cross-Cutting Skills

Cross-cutting skills focus on integrative, broad learning and are developed across courses and programs—over time and “in preparation for long-term career success” (Pasquerella, 2018). In AAC&U’s 2018 report, *Fulfilling the American Dream: Liberal Education and the Future of Work*, employers heavily endorsed the following cross-cutting skills: “oral communication, critical thinking, ethical judgment, working effectively in teams, written communication, and the real-world application of skills and knowledge” (Pasquerella, 2018). Further, employers highly prioritized: “locating, organizing, and evaluating information from multiple sources; analyzing complex problems; working with people from different backgrounds; being innovative and creative; and staying current on technologies” (Pasquerella, 2018).

Pasquerella, Lynn. 2018. [“Preparing Students for an Unscripted Future.”](#) *Liberal Education* 104(3).

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Direct Measures (connect with “Indirect Measures”)

Direct assessment measures “determine whether students have mastered the content of their academic programs” (Banta and Palomba, 2015: pp. 79). Direct measures gather evidence of learning through observable work products, such as: case studies, essays, exams, group projects, papers, portfolios, and presentations. Use *valid and reliable methods* to assess the content, or skills, involved in the learning.

Banta, Trudy W., and Catherine A. Palomba. 2015. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suskie, Linda. 2019. [“Understanding Direct and Indirect Evidence of Student Learning.”](#)

Formative Assessment (connect with “Summative Assessment”)

Formative assessment methods are used to “identify misconceptions, struggles, and learning gaps” (Yale University, 2019) that students might be experiencing, in order to support their learning. They are usually “*low stakes*, which means that they have low or no point value” (Eberly Center, 2019). For example, a faculty member might “monitor” learning through quizzes, polling, minute papers, etc. in order to provide consistent, ongoing feedback to students (Eberly Center, 2019). At the same time, formative assessments can alert faculty to add scaffolded approaches to their instructional design, so that students can achieve key learning aims (Ambrose, et al. 2010). As with summative assessment, formative assessments can be used for instructional redesign. (Formative assessment is best used in conjunction with summative assessment.)

Ambrose, Susan A., et al. 2010. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Carnegie Mellon University Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence & Educational Innovation. [“What is the Difference between Formative and Summative Assessment?”](#)

Yale University Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning. [“Formative and Summative Assessments.”](#)

Goals (connect with “Objectives” and “Outcomes”)

Goals are broad statements on learning over time. Goals focus on program-wide or institution-wide learning across the curriculum and co-curriculum. Learners should be able to master the skills described in goals at the completion of their degrees—and beyond. Goals can be developed at the institutional level (e.g., UDC’s Student Learning Goals) or the college/unit level, and by disciplinary accrediting agencies.

See page 16 for references...

Indirect Measures (connect with Direct Measures”)

Indirect assessment measures “ask students to reflect on what they have learned and experienced rather than to demonstrate their knowledge and skills,” e.g., “proxy information” about their learning (Banta and Palomba, 2015: pg. 80). Indirect measures can also focus on satisfaction with, or opinions on, programs and services. Indirect measures include: course evaluations, focus groups, interviews, peer feedback, and surveys. Use *valid and reliable methods* to assess metacognition and perceptions of learning.

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Banta, Trudy W., and Catherine A. Palomba. 2015. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Suskie, Linda. 2019. "[Understanding Direct and Indirect Evidence of Student Learning](#)."

Measurable and Observable

Measurable, in this instance, indicates that an observer (e.g., faculty member, supervisor) can gauge student learning using a *valid and reliable assessment measure* that typically produces some sort of metric or metrics. Measurable *verbs* are often mentioned in this context, which means that the verbs used in aligned objectives or outcomes point to an observable action on the part of the learner. **Observable** actions indicate that the observer will be able to assess a student work product (using an assessment measure) simply because that evidence of learning (e.g., the product) is perceptible.

Mission Statements (connect with "Vision Statements")

Mission statements clarify vision statements and are action-oriented—they describe *what* you do, *how* you do it, *why* you do it, and *who* you do it for (i.e., the unique qualifications of your unit). They use broad, simple, and clear language, and (like vision statements) reflect your core values while inspiring change. Mission statements are short (aim for 50-100 words) and they provide a basis for creating goals.

Centenary University. 2017. "[Tips for Writing Mission and Vision Statements](#)."

Connor, Julie. 2018. "[How to Write Powerful Vision & Mission Statements](#)."

Objectives (connect with "Goals" and "Outcomes")

Objectives are more specific than goals. Objectives signify intended/future learning, e.g., the learning that students will demonstrate by the end of a course or program. Objectives are *typically tied to the materials related to instruction, assignments, and assessment methods*. For example, when instructors plan their courses, they align their readings/videos, course assignments, and assessment tools to objectives. Measurable objectives reference the observable actions that students will demonstrate during their learning processes. Objectives can be developed for courses or programs, and by disciplinary accrediting agencies.

See page 16 for references...

Outcomes (connect with "Goals" and "Objectives")

Outcomes are more specific than goals and objectives. Outcomes describe what learners *should know and be able to do* by the end of an assignment or course. Outcomes are *typically tied to student work products*—or the results of the learning (prompted by assignments). This is why outcomes are so specific; they need to address *exactly* what students will demonstrate through their learning. To add even more specificity, you can make your outcomes time-bound. Measurable outcomes reference the *observable actions* that learners demonstrate in their work. Outcomes can be developed for assignments or courses.

See page 16 for references...

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Qualitative Data (connect with “Quantitative Data”)

Qualitative data are descriptive, and are gathered through methods such as “logs, journals, participant observations, focus groups, and interviews” (Banta and Palomba, 2015: pg. 24).

Banta, Trudy W., and Catherine A. Palomba. 2015. *Assessment Essentials: Planning, Implementing, and Improving Assessment in Higher Education*. 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quantitative Data (connect with “Qualitative Data”)

Quantitative data are numeric data based on totals, percentages, scores, ratings, etc., and are gathered via surveys and counting mechanisms.

Reliability (connect with “Validity”)

When an assessment tool provides *reliable data*, the tool is yielding *stable and consistent results*. Practitioners often cite different types of reliability, including:

- **Inter-Rater Reliability:** There is a high-level of agreement (e.g., approximate, similar, or same results) across “scores” from different assessors.
- **Test-Retest Reliability:** The tool produces stable and consistent results over time, e.g., when the tool is used to assess an exam that is administered more than once.

Phelan, Colin and Julie Wren. 2005-2006. [“Exploring Reliability \[and Validity\] in Academic Assessment.”](#) University of Northern Iowa Office of Academic Assessment.

Price, Paul C., Rajiv Jhangiani, and I-Chant A. Chiang. 2015. [“Reliability and Validity of Measurement.”](#) Pp. 82-87 in *Research Methods in Psychology*. 2nd Canadian ed. Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License.

Rhodes, Terrel. & Ashley Finley. 2013. *Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Stakeholder

Stakeholders in higher education consist of *anyone* who has a stake in the institution’s student learning outcomes and campus success, including: students, faculty, staff, administrators, employers, family members, community members, alumni, state and local governments, donors, and so on.

Summative Assessments

Summative assessment methods are used to evaluate student learning at the end of an instructional period, such as a module, course, or program (Eberly Center 2019; Yale University 2019). They are generally “*high stakes*, which means that they have a high point value” (Eberly Center, 2019). For example, a faculty member might offer a midterm exam, paper, speech, or capstone project (as well as a *variety* of these

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

assignments) as a summative assessment to evaluate student learning in relation to course objectives. As with formative assessment, summative assessments can be used for instructional redesign. (Summative assessment is best used in conjunction with formative assessment.)

Ambrose, S. A., et al. (2010). *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

[Formative and Summative Assessments](#)

[What is the Difference between Formative and Summative Assessment?](#)

Summative Assessment (connect with “Formative Assessment”)

Summative assessment methods are used to evaluate student learning at the end of an instructional period, such as a module, course, or program (Eberly Center 2019; Yale University 2019). They are generally “*high stakes*, which means that they have a high point value” (Eberly Center, 2019). For example, a faculty member might offer a midterm exam, paper, speech, or capstone project (as well as a *variety* of these assignments) as a summative assessment to evaluate student learning in relation to course objectives. As with formative assessment, summative assessments can be used for instructional redesign. (Summative assessment is best used in conjunction with formative assessment.)

Ambrose, Susan A., et al. 2010. *How Learning Works: Seven Research-Based Principles for Smart Teaching*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Carnegie Mellon University Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence & Educational Innovation. “[What is the Difference between Formative and Summative Assessment?](#)”

Yale University Poorvu Center for Teaching and Learning. “[Formative and Summative Assessments.](#)”

Targets (connect with “Baseline Data” and “Benchmarks”)

Targets are projected figures that practitioners set, which are based on previous results or existing standards. Meeting a target is an example of successfully working toward stated goals and objectives.

Validity (connect with “Reliability”)

When an assessment tool provides *valid data*, then the tool is *measuring what it is intended to measure*. To establish confidence that the tool is valid, it is “preferable” to “demonstrate more than one type of validity” (Rhodes and Finley, 2013: pg. 15). To that end, practitioners often cite several different types of validity, including:

- **Content Validity:** The definitions used throughout the tool are similarly interpreted by the assessors (i.e., the definitions reflect the *intended meanings* behind the defined terms). Subject matter experts can help establish content validity of the tool.
- **Face Validity:** The assessment tool appears to be valid, i.e., it is valid on the *face* of it. Widespread use of the tool, i.e., the tool’s legitimacy, can suggest face validity.
- **Formative Validity:** The tool is used to measure whether or not students are learning skills that are embedded in the program. The aligned activity or assignment (or other areas of the program) can then be improved upon—if the tool demonstrates that learners are not obtaining the affiliated skill(s).

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans and Reports

Academic, DSDS, Operational, and Administrative Units at the University of the District of Columbia

Healthy Simulation. "[Understanding Research for Clinical Simulation, Part2: Validity and Reliability.](#)"

Phelan, Colin and Julie Wren. 2005-2006. "[Exploring Reliability \[and Validity\] in Academic Assessment.](#)" University of Northern Iowa Office of Academic Assessment.

Price, Paul C., Rajiv Jhangiani, and I-Chant A. Chiang. 2015. "[Reliability and Validity of Measurement.](#)" Pp. 82-87 in *Research Methods in Psychology*. 2nd Canadian ed. Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 License.

Rhodes, Terrel. & Ashley Finley. 2013. *Using the VALUE Rubrics for Improvement of Learning and Authentic Assessment*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Statistics How To. 2017. "[Formative Validity & Summative Validity.](#)"

Vision Statements (connect with "Mission Statements")

Vision statements are mental images of what you believe is feasibly possible—they reflect your unit’s core values, using inspirational and aspirational language. Vision statements are very concise (aim for approximately ten words) and appeal to all stakeholders.

Centenary University. 2017. "[Tips for Writing Mission and Vision Statements.](#)"

Connor, Julie. 2018. "[How to Write Powerful Vision & Mission Statements.](#)"

Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes (References)

DePaul Teaching Commons. "[Course Objectives & Learning Outcomes.](#)"

Carnegie Mellon University Eberly Center for Teaching Excellence & Educational Innovation. "[Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes.](#)"

San Francisco State University. "[What Is the Difference Between Course Objectives and Learning Outcomes?](#)"

Oakland University Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning. 2014. "[Writing Course and Assessment Plans with Goals, Objectives, and Learning Outcomes.](#)"

Arizona State University TeachOnline. "[Writing Measurable Learning Objectives.](#)"