



# Administrative Unit Assessment at RIT

# Agenda

1. Overview
  - Institutional Effectiveness
  - Goals and Model
2. RIT Practices and Processes
  - University Assessment Council
  - Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Maps
  - RIT's Assessment Management System
  - Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report
3. Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report Results
4. Resources and Support

# Institutional Effectiveness

***The overarching question is, how well are we achieving our mission and goals?***

We answer this question by engaging in a systematic and ongoing assessment process, using results to make informed decisions and to properly allocate resources. The assessment of institutional effectiveness essentially involves a documented comparison of institutional performance to institutional purpose.

# RIT's Mission, Vision, and Strategic Goals

- RIT has a Vision and Mission, and corresponding Strategic Plan, Greatness Through Difference
- RIT's administrative units support the Vision, Mission, and Dimensions of the Strategic Plan; they demonstrate this by setting goals which align to the strategic plan
- Administrative units measure their goals and use assessment results to inform and guide continuous improvement (enhancing operations, planning, guiding decision making, allocating resources, etc.)

# Why do Administrative Unit Assessment?

- To demonstrate how effectively administrative units support RIT's mission, vision, and goals.
- To provide evidence of systematic processes (meaningful and sustainable) for continuous quality improvement

# Institutional Effectiveness Model at RIT



# RIT Practices and Processes

- Oversight and Support – UAC
- Institutional Effectiveness Map
- Annual Progress Report
  - Review Process
  - Rubric Rating System
  - Assessment Management System

# University Assessment Council (UAC)

- All RIT divisions represented
- Formal charge – oversight
- Key support areas
  - Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Map
  - Annual Progress Report



# The Institutional Effectiveness Map (IE Map)

- Tool to help administrative units measure their strategic goals and align these goals to university goals
- IE Maps contain six core elements:
  - **A mission/charge**
  - **Measurable outcomes/objectives** that align to the mission of the institution/division
  - **Data sources/activities** for assessment of those outcomes/objectives
  - **Benchmarks** to help assess achievement
  - The **timeline and person(s) responsible** for data collection/reporting
  - **Use of results to guide decisions/changes to improve** programs and services and **inform** planning, budgeting, and resource allocation

# The IE Map: A Snapshot

RIT ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT - INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS MAP

Administrative Unit: \_\_\_\_\_ Division: \_\_\_\_\_ Contact Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Charge/Mission: \_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Unit Outcome/Objective	Division Goal (if applicable)	RIT's Strategic Plan Dimensions and Inclusive Excellence Framework <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Double click on the check box to indicate SP Dimension alignment and/or IEF alignment	Data Source Unit Method/Measure Describe metrics or instruments used to measure results	Benchmark or Target Statement of Success/Measureable Outcome	Timeline & Person(s) Responsible Indicate Year, Cycle and/or Semester	Achievement of Outcome/Objective Indicate level of achievement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Double click on the check box to indicate level of achievement.	Next Steps or Actions What, if any, steps or actions will take place as a result of the assessment findings
		<b>Strategic Plan Dimensions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> One: People <input type="checkbox"/> Two: Programs <input type="checkbox"/> Three: Places <input type="checkbox"/> Four: Partnerships				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Approaching <input type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	
		<b>Strategic Plan Dimensions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> One: People <input type="checkbox"/> Two: Programs <input type="checkbox"/> Three: Places <input type="checkbox"/> Four: Partnerships				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Approaching <input type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	
		<b>Strategic Plan Dimensions</b> <input type="checkbox"/> One: People <input type="checkbox"/> Two: Programs <input type="checkbox"/> Three: Places <input type="checkbox"/> Four: Partnerships				<input type="checkbox"/> Not Met <input type="checkbox"/> Approaching <input type="checkbox"/> Met <input type="checkbox"/> Exceeded	

# Aligning IE Maps to RIT's Strategic Plan

Administrative Goals are mapped to RIT's Strategic Plan Dimensions.

**RIT's Strategic Plan Dimensions and Inclusive Excellence Framework**

Double click on the check box to indicate SP Dimension alignment and/or IEF alignment

**Strategic Plan Dimensions**

- One: People
- Two: Programs
- Three: Places
- Four: Partnerships

# IE Maps and Watermark

- IE Maps are housed in RIT's Assessment Management System, Taskstream by Watermark
  - an online system that provides a communication and resource hub for outcomes assessment and continuous improvement initiatives
- Office of EEA provides administrative units with Taskstream by Watermark training and support
- Administrative units maintain their own work spaces in Taskstream by Watermark



# Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report

The annual Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report (IE PR) was developed by the UAC for administrative units to demonstrate how they are supporting the university's mission and goals and using data to drive improvement processes.

The IE PR Survey is completed annually

**A.4. Identify if the benchmark was met or not met.**  
**REF ID:** Must record ASSESSMENT CYCLE, Key Findings folder for Administrative Units using Taskstream.

- Met/Exceeded
- Approaching (Progress Made)
- Not Met
- No Benchmark

**A.5. Summarize the key findings.**  
**REF ID:** Must record ASSESSMENT CYCLE, Key Findings folder for Administrative Units using Taskstream.

**A.6. Describe how the Administrative Unit used its key findings to guide decisions or changes to services, operations, processes, or impact to resource allocation.**  
**REF ID:** Must record ASSESSMENT CYCLE, Use of Results/Action Items folder for Administrative Units using Taskstream.

**A.7. Traditional Response Format: Follow-up from a Current or Prior Assessment Cycle**  
If the Administrative Unit conducted any follow-up assessment from a current or prior assessment cycle, please provide the following information.  
**REF ID:** Current or prior ASSESSMENT CYCLE, Use of Results/Action Items folder for Administrative Units using Taskstream.

**A.7a. Identify the objective:**

**A.7b. Briefly summarize the findings that informed or led to the change(s):**

**A.7c. List the implemented change(s):**

**A.7d. Provide the results from the assessment of the change(s):**

**A.7e. Describe if or how the change(s) led to any improvements:**

3

# IE PR Evaluation

The University Assessment Council evaluates each IE PR using the Continuous Improvement Rubric.

Units receive a Continuous Improvement Rubric rating of “No Evidence,” “Developing,” “Evidence,” or to “Exemplary”

**INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS  
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RUBRIC**

**Administrative Unit/Division:**

**Comment Basic: Please check all that apply to support the rating.**

**No Evidence**

- No assessment method described
- OR
- Described data collection efforts, but did not analyze data or identify key findings

**OR**

- Missing or lacking essential elements about the assessment process:
  - Objective
  - Benchmark
  - Data collection method (source of data)
  - Analysis
  - Findings
  - There is not a clear link between the objective, benchmark, and data or evidence that was collected
  - Not enough information is provided to determine how units used data to inform decisions or changes to guide improvements.

**Additional Comments:**

**Developing**

- Analyzed data and identified key findings, but did not tie analysis of assessment results to a decision, change, or improvement
- OR
- Described very general improvement, but specific details of assessment results were not included or the decision or change to guide improvements was not related to identified key findings

**OR**

- Clear alignment of objective, benchmark, and assessment method.
- Analyzed data and used it to correct rationale for next steps
- Described a decision, change, or improvement or to describe the impact of the decision, change, or improvement or to describe the impact of the decision, change, or improvement and clear articulation of use of results

**Additional Comments:**

**INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS  
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RUBRIC**

**Comment Basic: Please check all that apply to support the rating.**

**Evidence**

- Objective is clearly stated and has a corresponding data collection method(s).
- Fully described the assessment process including the objective, benchmark, and data collection method/results.
- Effective explanation of data analysis and key findings.
- Clear relationship between data and decision or change to guide improvements to services, operations, processes, or impact resource allocations.
- Explained rationale for no change.
- Did not assess the impact of the change or decision made to determine if an improvement. Or, was not able to assess the impact of a change/decision given the assessment effort.

**Additional Comments:**

**INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS  
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RUBRIC**

**Comment Basic: Please check all that apply to support the rating.**

**Exemplary**

- Objective is clearly stated and has a corresponding data collection method(s).
- Fully described the assessment process including the objective, benchmark, and data collection method/results.
- Effective explanation of data analysis and key findings.
- Clear relationship between data and decision or change to guide improvements to services, operations, processes, or impact resource allocations.
- Assessed the impact of the change, decision, or improvement.

**Additional Comments:**

**INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS - ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS  
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT RUBRIC**

**Overview**

RIT's strategic plan prioritizes assessment and renewal to guide planning, resource allocation, continual improvement, and effective responses to opportunities and challenges. To this end, RIT's University Assessment Council is focused on developing practices to support the demonstration of how effectively administrative units support RIT's mission, vision, and goals. The process provides each administrative unit the opportunity to show how they use assessment results for continuous improvement (enhancing operations, planning, guiding decision making, allocating resources, etc.) RIT is committed to establishing systematic methods for assessing administrative unit goals and administrative units.

**Definitions**

**Assessment:** The systematic and ongoing process of planning, making informed decisions, and allocating resources by collecting, assessing, and acting on data relative to how well the institution is achieving its mission and purposes. The overarching institutional effectiveness question is, *how well are we achieving our mission and goals?* The assessment of institutional effectiveness essentially involves a documented comparison of institutional performance to institutional purpose (adapted from MSQH).

**Continuous Improvement:** An approach to work that systematically seeks to achieve changes in processes, procedures, services, programs, etc. in order to improve quality and efficiency. This approach embraces the belief that improvement is not something that starts and stops, but something that requires an organization's cultural and administrative unit commitment to an ongoing process of planning, learning, reflecting, refining, and improving.

**Framing Language**

This rubric is designed to holistically assess administrative units' use of data to continuously improve. Elements of continuous improvement include: identifying clearly articulated goals, determining a benchmark for success, implementing strategies to achieve those goals; assessing the achievement of the goals; and using assessment findings to improve and reform planning and resource allocation. The rubric will reward demonstrating continuous improvement, but we acknowledge each unit designed goals and objectives and assessment methods including demonstrating continuous improvement, but we acknowledge each unit designed goals and objectives and determining continuous improvement for administrative units at RIT. Each level of the rubric provides a holistic approach to identifying improvement processes. This process is designed to be formative as administrative units will receive feedback on how well the unit demonstrates continuous improvement.

RIT Institutional Effectiveness | Administrative Units | 2018

# Sharing IE PR Results

RIT's annual Institutional Effectiveness Progress Report data is aggregated, analyzed, and shared with the campus community.



## IE PR Goal

RIT's goal is that 100% of its administrative units are rated "Effective" or higher on their annual progress report submissions.



# Resources and Support for Administrative Units

Resources and support for administrative units are available at EEA website. Here, you will find:

- IE Map Planning Guide
- IE Checklist for Chairs and Directors
- Sample IE Maps
- Information about workshops and training

# For Questions and Support, contact the Office of Educational Effectiveness Assessment:

Dr. Leah Bradley  
Director

Kate Scahill  
Assistant Director

Grace Rubin  
Assessment Management System Coordinator

[www.rit.edu/outcomes](http://www.rit.edu/outcomes)