

Administrative Unit/Division _____ Type: ☐ Traditional or ☐ Narrative

<input type="checkbox"/> No Evidence	Comment Bank: Please check all that apply to support the rating.
<input type="checkbox"/> No assessment method described OR <input type="checkbox"/> Described data collection efforts, but did not analyze data or identify key findings	<input type="checkbox"/> Missing or lacking essential elements about the assessment process: <input type="checkbox"/> Objective <input type="checkbox"/> Benchmark <input type="checkbox"/> Data collection method (source of data) <input type="checkbox"/> Analysis <input type="checkbox"/> Findings <input type="checkbox"/> There is not a clear link between the objective, benchmark, and data or evidence that was collected. <input type="checkbox"/> Not enough information is provided to determine how unit used data to inform decisions or changes to guide improvements. Additional Comments:
<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	Comment Bank: Please check all that apply to support the rating.
<input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data and identified key findings, but did not tie analysis of assessment results to a decision, change, or improvement OR <input type="checkbox"/> Described very general improvement, but specific details are not provided or the decision or change to guide improvements was not related to identified key findings	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear alignment of objective, benchmark, and assessment method. <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data and identified key findings <input type="checkbox"/> Need to connect analysis and findings to a decision, change, or improvement or to describe the rationale for no change. <input type="checkbox"/> Need to provide a more thorough description of the findings and clearer articulation of use of results <input type="checkbox"/> Described a decision or change without linking it to data or findings. Additional Comments:

<input type="checkbox"/> Effective	Comment Bank: Please check all that apply to support the rating.
<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data and identified key findings from the assessment of a unit level goals/objective(s) </div> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Described decision or change made to improve services, operations, processes, or impact to resource allocation </div> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Intentionally determined change not needed and provided rationale for no change </div>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Objective is clearly stated and has a corresponding data collection method(s). </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Fully described the assessment processes including the objective, benchmark, and data collection method/results. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Effective explanation of data analysis and key findings. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Clear relationship between data and decision or change to guide improvements to services, operations, processes, or impact resource allocations. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Explained rationale for no change. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> 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 cycle. </div> <p>Additional Comments:</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	Comment Bank: Please check all that apply to support the rating.
<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Met "Effective" criteria </div> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Implemented a data-driven change identified from the current or previous assessment cycle </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Analyzed data to assess the impact of the change to services, operations, processes, practices, or resource allocation </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Described how the change led to an improvement or why the change did not yield an improvement or efficiency </div>	<div> <input type="checkbox"/> Objective is clearly stated and has a corresponding data collection method(s). </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Fully described the assessment processes including the objective, benchmark, and data collection method/results. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Effective explanation of data analysis and key findings. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Clear relationship between data and decision or change to guide improvements to services, operations, processes, or impact resource allocations. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Unit implemented a data-driven change, analyzed data to assess the impact of the change, and described how the change did/did not lead to an improvement. </div> <div> <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative unit demonstrates a robust assessment process that supports continuous improvement efforts. </div> <p>Additional Comments:</p>

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 processes provide 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

Institutional Effectiveness: 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 MSCHE).

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 organizational and administrative unit commitment to an ongoing process of planning, assessing, 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 inform planning and resource allocation. The rubric will be used to review administrative units' progress report submissions. RIT administrative units share some common attributes including demonstrating continuous improvement, but we acknowledge each unit designed goals and objectives and assessment methods appropriate to their core business functions and customers. The rubric provides a holistic approach to identifying and determining continuous improvement for administrative units at RIT. Each level of the rubric identifies associated continuous improvement processes. This process is designed to be formative as administrative units will receive feedback on how well the unit demonstrates continuous improvement.