

**MSU Institutional Goal Evaluation System Draft**  
**March 17, 2005**

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.

**Assessment Indicator Quality:** The examination of the quality, quantity, and variety of the assessments used to measure institutional goal attainment is important in determining the meaningfulness of the information and data generated. Assessments (i.e., indicators) need to be appropriate for and aligned to the 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 indicators 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 and in improving operations and programs. Assessments 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 and in improving operations and programs. 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 and in improving operations and programs. 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.

**Assessment Performance Level:** Explicit statements of goal attainment and progress should be able to be determined from the assessment measure(s). The level of goal attainment and progress may be determined by criterion and/or normative comparison.

<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
Assessment data suggests 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 current status or direction of change is either at an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction.	Assessment data suggests current status or direction of change is at a qualitatively different and advanced/mature level.

**Improvement Initiatives & Approaches:** Initiatives and strategies for goal attainment and achievement should be examined to provide feedback related to institutional priority, efficiency, cost, and innovation.

<b>Unacceptable</b>	<b>Acceptable</b>	<b>Target</b>
Strategies and initiatives may be inadequately or inappropriately funded, 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.	Strategies and initiatives may be appropriate, efficient, and effective 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 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 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:

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

The cycle will repeat in four-year blocks.

Prior to the start of each academic year, institutional goal assessment task force members will be selected. 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:*

The institutional goal assessment task force will be formed and meet by the last week of October of the academic year in which each 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; Assessment Performance Levels; and Goal Strategies & Initiatives. 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>).