

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., 2025-2026).
- 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:

- 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*.

Meta-Assessment Rubric for Evaluating Assessment Plans

Ratings should be assigned based on the overall quality and coherence *of each section*. Keep the following in mind when selecting ratings:

- **Developing:** Largely missing, unclear, or misaligned; substantial revision needed
- **Minimally Compliant:** Present, mostly acceptable, and aligned, but limited in quality or detail
- **Good:** Clear, complete, and aligned; meets expectations
- **Exemplary:** Clear, complete, aligned, and well-justified; exceeds expectations

Program/Unit Name:

Assessment Cycle:

Goals

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

High-quality goals: • 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.	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	• No goals provided	• 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, as reflected in its mission or official documentation.
Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				

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.

High-quality objectives: - Clearly align with goals - Isolate a single 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. - Each goal should be supported by more than one objective.	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	- None entered; or - None fully address specifications for an objective	At least one fully meets all stated specifications for a high-quality objective.	Most address all specifications	- More than one objective per goal - All address all specifications
Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				

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).

High-quality indicators/KPIs : <i>Alignment & Appropriateness</i> - Clearly align with objectives - Clearly show how they can provide data for improving learning and performance <i>Method & Source</i> - 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.) <i>Interpretability & Evidence Quality</i> - Include direct measures as the primary source of evidence, with indirect measures used to complement them. <i>Review & Decision-Making</i> - Who will review the results and when they will be reviewed 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 <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				

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.

High-quality criteria/targets: • 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 achievable) • Include contextual information (e.g., prior results, disciplinary norms, institutional benchmarks) demonstrating that the criterion or target is ambitious yet achievable.	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	• 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 <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				

Findings/Results

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

High-quality findings/results: - Align with the corresponding target for success - Be concise and well-organized - Provide results that clearly inform decisions about 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)	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	- 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
N/A – New unit in plan year under review. No findings/results collected yet. Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				
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.				

Actions

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

High-quality actions: - 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	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	- None entered; or - None fully address specifications for a finding/result; or - All actions focus solely on continuing current processes without justification based on findings.	At least one addresses most specifications	Most address most specifications	All address most specifications
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.	N/A – New unit in plan year under review. No findings/results collected yet to inform actions. Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>			

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: • 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	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	• 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 included sufficient information to demonstrate progress • Provides general detail (lacks some specificity)	• Addresses all items from previous PCI • Previous PCI included thorough, specific, and well-documented information • Provides specific detail (who, what, when, where, why)
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.	N/A – New unit in plan year under review. Previous PCI not available. (Note: Units that existed prior to this year should have a Previous PCI. If they did not write one, then they should be marked as Developing.) Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>			

New PCI

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

The New PCI should: • 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.	Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
	• 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 • Includes sufficient information to demonstrate progress • Provides general detail (lacks some specificity)	• Includes all actions from the current plan • Includes thorough, specific, and well-documented information • Provides specific detail (who, what, when, where, why)
Reviewer Feedback <i>Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.</i>				

Overall Rating

Please select an overall rating for the assessment plan.

Ratings should be assigned based on the overall quality and coherence *of the plan*. Keep the following in mind when selecting ratings:

- **Developing:** Largely unclear or misaligned; substantial revision needed
- **Minimally Compliant:** Mostly acceptable and aligned, but limited in quality or detail
- **Good:** Clear, complete, and aligned; meets expectations
- **Exemplary:** Clear, complete, aligned, and well-justified; exceeds expectations

Developing	Minimally Compliant	Good	Exemplary
Reviewer Feedback Consider commenting on strengths, opportunities for improvement, and any recommendations for enhancement.			