

**An Evaluation System for MSU Institutional Goals**  
**Draft – February 14, 2006**

Assessment should be at the core of an institution’s continuous improvement efforts and should allow the examination of whether institutional mission and goals are being met (Banta, 1999). In the mission and goals of Minnesota State University, Mankato (MSU) is this statement: “The University, as a whole and in all of its parts, will establish **priorities** through **planning and assessment processes** that anticipate our needs and focus our efforts and **resources** in support of our mission and goals.” MSU is an institution driven by planning and prioritization, and this planning and prioritization requires evidence provided by assessment. The examination of institutional assessment evidence (i.e., performance indicators), performance levels, and initiatives and strategies for goal attainment is necessary in guiding institutional decision-making and gauging progress. The following rating system (i.e., report card) is designed to evaluate MSU institutional goal progress as related to three variables: Assessment Indicator Quality; Assessment Performance Level; and Goal Strategies & Initiatives.

**How Good are the Assessment Measures?** The examination of the quality, quantity, and variety of the assessment measures used to determine institutional goal attainment is important in examining the meaningfulness of the information and data generated. Assessment measures (i.e., indicators) need to be appropriate for and aligned to stated institutional goals and outcomes. Appropriateness implies that consistent categories of information appear in both the assessment and its corresponding goal(s). In addition, assessment quality should be measured by examining its congruency with the complexity and requirements of the corresponding institutional goal(s). Also, there is a need to apply multiple assessment measures at various times to examine institutional goals and outcomes that are generally complex and broad in nature.

<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
Assessment measures are not comprehensive and/or integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Assessment indicators may have sources of bias with little to no effort having been made to establish fairness, accuracy, and/or consistency in procedures.	Assessment measures are comprehensive and integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment.. Multiple assessments are used with little if any sources of bias. Efforts are made to ensure and establish assessment fairness, accuracy, and consistency.	Assessment measures are comprehensive and integrated to provide information in monitoring goal attainment. Multiple assessments are used at various times and steps are taken to eliminate sources of bias. Thorough investigation and/or supportive data exists that establishes fairness, accuracy, and consistency of the assessment procedures.

**Were the Goal(s) Achieved?** How did we do in attempting to meet our institutional goals? The answer to this question can be determined by criterion and/or normative comparison. The examination of direct and indirect performance information lets us know how well we are doing in meeting any institutional goal(s).

<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
Assessment data suggests that the institutional goal is not being met and that current status or direction of change is undesirable or not improving as quickly as desired. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area.	Assessment data suggests that the institutional goal is being met and that current status or direction of change is either at an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction.	Assessment data suggests that institutional goal is clearly met and that current status or direction of change is high quality and may be at an advanced/mature level.

**Are Goal Strategies & Approaches Working?** It is important to know whether institutional activities, processes and initiatives are actually helping to meet institutional goals. Is what we are doing really an institutional priority? Is what we are doing the most efficient, innovative and cost-effective approach?

This information will let us know if the specific actions we are taking are working and whether specific initiatives or approaches should be continued, adjusted, or deleted.

<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
Goal strategies and initiatives may be inadequately or inappropriately funded, not based on previous data, limited in number and/or scope, inefficient, or ineffective to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of improvement. Immediate, high priority actions should be taken to address this area. Strategies may not be supported by data collection conclusions.	Goal strategies and initiatives may be appropriate, efficient, effective, and based on some previous data, but may need some change in course of action, funding, and/or number needed to provide sustainable momentum in this goal area. Most strategies are based on and supported by data collection conclusions.	No immediate change in strategies and initiatives is required. However, continuing support should be provided to sustain achievement in this goal area. Strategies are clearly supported and driven by data sources and collection conclusions.

**Process Implementation:**

*Calendar of Outcome Examination:* Institutional Goals will be evaluated on a four-year cycle. A proposed assessment cycle is printed below with the cycle repeating in four-year blocks.

Academic Year	Goals
2006-2007	1
2007-2008	2 & 3
2008-2009	4 & 5
2009-2010	6 & 7

Prior to the start of each academic year, institutional goal assessment task force members will be selected for each goal measured. Membership will be drawn from a combination of all bargaining units and include faculty, staff, student, and administrative representation from across all divisions (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Finance & Administration, Information & Technology, Advancement). In addition, representation from the local community would also be sought. Task force membership will be limited to 10-15 members.

*Review Process:* An institutional goal assessment task force will be formed for each goal assessed and meet by the last week of October of the academic year in which an institutional goal is evaluated. The task force will meet during the academic year to review and evaluate MSU institutional goal progress as related to: Assessment Indicator Quality; Goal Attainment; and Goal Initiatives, Strategies & Approaches. Specifically, the task force will proceed through four basic stages of work: data gathering, analysis, rating, and recommendation. The data gathering period will include the identification of measures or performance indicators that provide goal attainment information. In addition, initiatives and strategies related to goals would be identified as well as the various data sources that would be available to guide decision-making as related to goal attainment. The analysis stage would involve a review and interpretation of collected materials. The rating stage would involve the task force providing summary decisions and explanations as to institutional goal performance based on the Goal Evaluation Rubrics described above. The recommendation stage would involve the task force making suggestions as related to indicator and initiative/strategy quantity, quality, meaningfulness, accuracy, and/or fairness. Ratings, corresponding explanations, and recommendations for all areas would be contained in a final written report that would be completed by the end of the academic year (approximately May 15<sup>th</sup>).