

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RUBRIC
(SUNY Council on Assessment)

<https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/assessment/Institutional-Effectiveness-Rubric-Branded.pdf>

Modified for use by the Utica University Institutional Effectiveness Committee (April 2019)

| Element | Outcome | Exemplary | Established | Developing | No Evidence |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Plan | <i>The institution has a formal assessment plan that documents an organized, sustained assessment process covering all major administrative departments, student support services, and academic programs.</i> | A written plan specifies responsibility for conducting assessment at departmental and institutional levels. The plan further indicates timelines and procedures and notes how assessment findings are channeled into strategic planning and budgeting. | All functional areas conduct assessment systematically and may have written policies to guide the process. However, there is no institutional plan that serves to coordinate how assessment findings improve institutional effectiveness. | Some, but not all, functional areas conduct assessment systematically, and these areas have policies and procedures for their assessment processes. However, there is no coordination of or standards for assessment set by the institution. | No institutional plan for assessment. Assessment may be conducted at the institution, but on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis, usually in response to specific challenges or accreditation mandates. |
| Goals | <i>Measurable goals have been articulated for the institution and within functional areas, including courses, programs, departments and nonacademic units.</i> | All departments at the institution and the institution itself have clearly articulated, measurable goals. Expected or aspirational outcomes are inherent in the goals. | All departments have goals, but not all are clearly stated, and the desired outcomes may lack clarity. | Some but not all departments have clearly stated goals and/or goals are more of an operational checklist, a “to do” list. | Neither the institution nor its departments has clearly stated, measurable goals that identify expected or aspirational outcomes. |
| Alignment/ Mapping | <i>Specific goals (e.g. course-level, department-level) are mapped to broader, “higher-level” goals (e.g. Key Intellectual Skills, strategic goals) and the institutional mission.</i> | Departments indicate how their goals and outcomes map to the institution’s mission and goals. When appropriate, they are also linked to accreditation standards. | Departments map their goals to the institutional mission and goals, but some of the linking seems arbitrary or too much of a stretch. Likewise with mapping to accreditation standards. | Not all departments have mapped their goals to the institution’s mission and goals or current accreditation standards. | There is no evidence of alignment between departmental missions and goals and the mission and goals of the institution. |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|---|
| Culture | <i>All appropriate members of the individual department are involved in assessment activities.</i> | All members of the University are knowledgeable about assessment activities. Each department involves key stakeholders in its assessment processes, and the University's leadership team frequently articulate the importance of assessment and its contribution to continuous improvement and decision-making. | All departments involve faculty or staff in some aspect of assessment—e.g. planning and collecting data, reviewing assessment results, implementing program-level improvements based on assessment findings. | Some departments involve faculty or staff in their assessment processes. Likewise, some but not all departments share results with key stakeholders. | In most departments, assessment is done by lone individuals charged with assessment responsibilities (usually a director or department chair). |
| Methods & Findings | <i>Assessment results are gathered from multiple sources and measures.</i> | Assessment is based on multiple measures of performance, including direct and indirect and qualitative and quantitative data. | The institution and its departments use a combination of direct and indirect measures to assess goals. | The institution and its departments rely primarily on indirect measures. Assessment tools are poorly defined, not appropriate to the goal, or poorly constructed. | Not clear how institutional or departmental goals are being assessed. Because the goals are more of a checklist or action steps, they cannot be properly measured by any assessment method |
| Sustainability | <i>Assessment is ongoing, systematic, and conducted in a manner that is sustainable over the long term.</i> | Assessment is routinely conducted in all appropriate departments. The sustainability of assessment processes is evident by the fact that they are regular, ongoing, and systematic. Assessment continues despite turnover in departments. | Assessment is routinely conducted in most but not all appropriate departments. The sustainability of assessment processes varies with respect to how regularly it occurs or how systematically goals are measured. Efforts have sometimes been thwarted by staff turnover. | The institution can document that sustainable assessment activity is regularly occurring in several departments at the University (notably, academic departments), but practices are not universal or sustainable for the long term. | There is no evidence of sustainable assessment activity occurring within any functional department at the University (academic, student services/support, athletics, and administrative offices). |
| Communication | <i>Results are easily accessible. They are communicated to all relevant parties and analyzed by key stakeholders.</i> | Assessment results are disseminated to appropriate audiences at appropriate times. Data appropriate to both internal and external audiences are easily accessible. | Departments within the University share assessment findings with one another or make them accessible to others at the institution. Public disclosure is limited. | Assessment results are owned by the specific department and shared with others only via the review process. | Assessment results, if they exist, reside within the individual department and are not shared with or communicated to others. |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|---|---|
| Planning & Resources | <i>Assessment findings are routinely considered in planning and budgeting processes.</i> | The institution is able to demonstrate that planning and budgeting processes have routinely used assessment data in decision-making. | Assessment findings are used in planning and budgeting, but there is no clear mechanism in place to ensure this is routinely accomplished. | Assessment findings from only a few departments are used to inform planning and budgeting processes. Institutional planning and budgeting decisions are based something other than assessment findings. | Assessment findings remain within the department where they were collected. It is not clear how planning or budgeting decisions are made. |
| Using Assessment Results | <i>Assessment findings are used to inform continuous improvement.</i> | The institution is committed to using assessment to inform improvement; there is documented evidence that assessment results, especially those related to student learning, are routinely used for institutional improvement. | There is evidence that all departments regularly use assessment results to inform improvements within their own operations. | There is some evidence that assessment results are used occasionally to inform institutional improvement or departmental effectiveness. | Assessment continues to be done for compliance purposes; there is little evidence that results are used to inform institutional improvement or departmental |