

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports

For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

This meta-rubric is used to evaluate institutional assessment reports from programs/offices in Academic Affairs, Administration, the Division of Student Development and Success, and Operations at UDC. This meta-rubric is also aligned with the five stages (and eight steps) of [UDC's Cycle of Continuous Improvement](#).

When reviewing assessment reports, evaluators should reference the **performance descriptors** (across **four performance levels**) for each of the **eight rubric criteria**. Thus, once evaluators have selected a performance level for each criterion in the complementary feedback form, they should **use language from the meta-rubric in the comments sections of the form**. Evaluators should also give consideration to both qualitative and quantitative approaches to assessment, recognize improvement plans, and provide suggestions/considerations for next steps.

Below is a diagram of the meta-rubric's components. There is also a **glossary of terms** starting on page 11 of this document. *This rubric was originally developed by UDC's University Assessment Committee in 2015-2016, then updated by UDC's Director of Institutional Assessment and Outcomes in Spring 2019 and Summer 2021.*

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

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports

For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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 unit, and provides a basis for creating goals.</p> <p><i>Note: this criterion pertains to the mission statement of the overarching <u>unit</u>.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (between 50 and 100 words) • Describes primary functions of the unit (what the unit does and how it does it, e.g., activities) and distinguishes the unit from other units at UDC • Identifies stakeholders (and recognizes their needs) • Aligned with UDC's mission statement • Uses language that aligns with goals • Clarifies the vision statement and has a long-term focus • Includes purpose specific to the unit (the "why") 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (the statement may be a little over 100 words, but it's not excessively long or wordy) • The unit's functions are provided, but the statement is somewhat limited in description of activities • Identifies stakeholders • Aligned with UDC's mission statement • Uses language that aligns with goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mission statement is too general to distinguish from other units at UDC 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 alignment with UDC's mission statement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No mission statement is provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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.</p> <p>Note: <i>this criterion pertains to the vision statement of the overarching <u>unit</u>.</i></p> <p>Note: <i>a vision statement is not required for all units.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (roughly 10 words) • Identifies stakeholders • Aligned with the mission of the unit and the institution as a whole • Feasible • Aspirational (future-oriented) and inspirational (reflects core values) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and concise (the statement may be more than 10 words, but it's not excessively long or wordy) • Identifies stakeholders • Aligned with the mission of the unit and the institution as a whole • Feasible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A vision statement is provided, but it's not clear or concise • Does not identify stakeholders • Does not demonstrate clear alignment with the mission of the unit and/or the institution as a whole 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No vision statement is provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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>Note: <i>this criterion pertains to <u>unit</u> goals.</i></p> <p>Note: <i>where relevant, unit goals can be aligned with goals from other processes (e.g., goals from Strategic Plans, SMART goals in Performance Management Processes)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3-5 clearly-written goals are provided; goals are focused on broad, cross-cutting skills that are achieved over time; operational goals are clear and aligned with desired benchmarks/ targets • Goals describe desired performance of a unit—and they are aligned with activities and deliverables • Goals are aligned with the unit's mission • Focused on benefitting recipients of the service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 clearly-written goals are provided; goals are focused on broad skills that are achieved over time; operational goals are clear and aligned with desired benchmarks/ targets • Goals describe desired performance of a unit • Goals are aligned with the unit's mission • 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” • Goals describe current unit processes rather than ongoing, desired performance of the unit • Goals do not demonstrate clear alignment with the unit's mission • Not written to benefit the recipients of the service 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No goals are stated
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Objectives</p> <p>Specific statements that describe future performance on “cross-cutting” skills or operational goals. Objectives are the measurable and observable equivalent to goals.</p> <p><i>Note: this criterion pertains to <u>program/office/project objectives</u>.</i></p> <p><i>Note: where relevant, program objectives can be aligned with objectives from other processes (e.g., Strategic Goals, SMART goals)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3-5 objectives per goal are provided; objectives are specific, measurable, and observable Each objective is clearly aligned with unit goals—and they are aligned with activities/deliverables Objectives are aligned with the mission of the unit and division of which it is a part Written in future tense—as ongoing, desired end results for stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3 objectives per goal are provided; objectives are specific, measurable, and observable Each objective is aligned with unit goals Objectives are aligned with the mission of the unit and division of which it is a part Language is well-suited to the aligned goal(s), but is somewhat vague or needs revision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least one-half (50%) of the provided objectives are incompletely stated, e.g., not specific, measurable, or aligned with goals Does not demonstrate clear alignment with the mission of the unit and division of which it is a part 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objectives are stated
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports

For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Measures of Assessment (Activities and Assessment Methods)</p> <p>Measures of assessment include: qualitative and quantitative, direct and indirect, formative and summative, and diagnostic. A “mixed” or variety of measures should be used to evaluate goals and objectives, with clear information on means for gathering data.</p> <p>Note: <i>this criterion pertains to <u>program/office/project</u> measures.</i></p> <p>Note: <i>ideally, measures will provide valid and reliable data.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both direct and indirect measures are used across the assessment plan, with an emphasis on direct measures Mixed measures are used for some or all objectives Measures are described with ample detail (programs may include supporting documentation, e.g., assignments, projects, or workshop descriptions & methods used to assess these activities, such as rubrics or surveys) Clearly aligned with goals and objectives Purposeful; it’s clear how measures will be used for program success Feasible—existing practices are used where possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct measures are used across the assessment plan At least one measure is used for each objective in the assessment plan Measures are 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 across the assessment plan Measures are identified for some, but not all, objectives in the assessment plan Measures are described in vague terms Some measures are not clearly aligned with goals and objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No measures of assessment are used or insufficient details are provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Benchmarks/ Targets</p> <p>Benchmarks are numbers or percentages that are used to compare current performance against standards that adopt “best” or recommended practices. Targets are projected figures based on previous results or existing standards.</p> <p><i>Note: this criterion pertains to <u>program/office/project</u> benchmarks or targets.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks or targets are identified for all of the assessment activities Benchmarks or targets are suitable for the assessment activities (i.e., represent a feasible/reasonable amount of success) Measurable and quantifiable (e.g., an increase of 5%) or descriptive and clear Targets are based on previous results or existing standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks or targets are identified for some or most assessment activities Benchmarks or targets are suitable for the assessment activities (i.e., represent a feasible/reasonable amount of success) Measurable and quantifiable (e.g., an increase of 5%) or descriptive and clear Targets appear to be arbitrary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Benchmarks or targets are limited or missing Benchmarks or targets are unsuitable for the assessment activities (e.g., targets are too high or too low) Language used to describe benchmarks or targets are vague or subjective (e.g., “improve,” “satisfactory”) Targets appear to be arbitrary with no connection to existing standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No benchmarks or targets are identified
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Analysis/Results</p> <p>A complete, concise analysis and summary of the data/results are presented for each assessment measure.</p> <p>Note: <i>this criterion pertains to <u>program/office/project analysis/results</u>.</i></p> <p>Note: <i>all data and supporting documentation must be anonymized.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete, concise, and well-organized analyses are provided • Both quantitative data (e.g., tables, charts, graphs) and qualitative data (e.g., reflections, descriptions, summaries) are provided • Addresses whether goals and objectives were met, partially met, or not met • Addresses benchmarks or targets—compares findings to previous results and/or existing standards (as appropriate) • Includes supporting documentation (i.e., rich examples of previous and/or current data) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete, concise, and well-organized analyses are provided • Only quantitative data are provided (e.g., tables, charts, graphs) – no qualitative data • Addresses whether goals and objectives were met, partially met, or not met • Does not address benchmarks or targets • May contain too much information or stray slightly from the data set 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incomplete and/or wordy analyses are provided • Only quantitative data are provided (e.g., tables, charts, graphs) – no qualitative data • Goals and objectives are not appropriately addressed • Does not address benchmarks or targets • Questionable data collection/analysis with misaligned conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No analysis/results are provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports
For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

Criteria	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Actions for Continuous Improvement</p> <p>Actions describe specific steps taken that lead to improvements in program/office processes, based on analysis/results. Actions also highlight demonstrated effectiveness/success. Results are shared widely with stakeholders.</p> <p><i>Note: this criterion pertains to <u>program/office/project actions</u>.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies at least 3 actions per office/program in the improvement plan Addresses goals/objectives & highlights success Clearly identifies areas for improvement and next steps, e.g., how results will be used to modify objectives, activities, planning, resource allocation, assessment strategies, etc. Includes a clear timeframe for implementing actions and determining follow-up Identifies a responsible party Clearly describes how results will be shared with and distributed to stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies at least 1 action per office/program in the improvement plan Addresses goals/objectives & highlights success Describes with some detail how results will be used to modify objectives, activities, planning, resource allocation, assessment strategies, etc. Includes a timeframe for implementing actions Identifies a responsible party Briefly notes how results will be shared with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan is limited and not related to the assessment results Doesn't address goals/objectives appropriately Lacks "next steps" for systematic program/office improvement Too general; not enough details are provided re: timeframe, responsible party, follow-up, etc. No discussion of how results will be shared with stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Actions for continuous improvement are not provided
Comments				

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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 Institutional Assessment Reports

For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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.

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

Baseline data are the foundational data that units use to help create their planning or assessment processes. Baseline data are starting points, or ground-level data, that units gather when setting their benchmarks and targets.

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

Benchmarks are numbers or percentages that are used to compare current performance against standards that adopt “best” or recommended 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/achievement 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

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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).

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”)

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports

For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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.

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

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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...

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.

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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 (e.g., internal, longitudinal data) 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).

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.

Meta-Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Assessment Reports For All Reporting Units at the University of the District of Columbia (UDC)

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.](#)"