

## INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRESS REPORT 9

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 2023–2024

RIT's annual *Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Progress Report* demonstrates how administrative units meet their strategic goals and engage in continuous quality improvement. The University Assessment Council (UAC) serves as the advisory body on institutional effectiveness, coordinating the annual assessment process in conjunction with the Office of Educational Effectiveness Assessment (EEA). Representatives from RIT divisions and the National Technical Institute for the Deaf (NTID) participate in this process.

#### The IE Progress Report Process

Administrative units from RIT Divisions participated in the IE Progress Report 9 process by completing an annual report and submitting an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Map. The annual report focuses on highlighting the assessment of unit-level goals and describing how the unit utilized data to inform decisions and implement changes that improve services, operations, and processes. The ultimate goal of the process is to demonstrate how administrative units are working to reach the goals of the RIT Strategic Plan, Greatness Through Difference. UAC representatives rate each submission using the Institutional Effectiveness Continuous Improvement Rubric. The rubric has a four-point scale measuring the degree to which the unit demonstrates continuous quality improvement.

During a summer 2024 retreat, UAC revised the Progress Report instrument to help units easily articulate and utilize results for continuous improvement. Additionally, UAC updated the language used in the rubric to more accurately reflect engagement in the continuous improvement process. The numeric rubric scores remained the same, with adjustments to the description of each score. The new rubric categories are Did Not Engage in Improvement Efforts (1), Engaged in Measurement Efforts (2), Initiated Continuous Improvement Cycle (3), and Completed Continuous Improvement Cycle (4). UAC made these changes based on prior results and feedback from units. As part of the review process, units submitted IE Maps, which outline goals, measures and outcomes so that reviewers were able have more context when evaluating reports and UAC reps could provide enhanced support to unit leaders.

#### IE Progress Report Results

The university benchmark for the IE Progress Report is 100% of units to receive a rubric rating of *Initiated Continuous Improvement Cycle* (3) or better. The percentage of units scoring 3 or better increased to 94.2%, a gain of over two percentage points from last year.

Key findings from the IE Progress Report include:

- 68 administrative units submitted the IE Progress Report (Table 1)
- 94.2% of participating units scored *Effective* or higher
- 60% (n=6) of the divisions had **all units** score *Effective* or *Exemplary* (Table 2)
- 100% of participating units reported alignment of unit-level goals to the strategic plan (Table 3)
- 5 units are restructuring and 1 did not submit
- 59 programs submitted a current IE Map (87%)

**Table 1: Five-Year Rubric Rating Trends**

|                                                             | 2018.20<br>(n=66) | 2020.21<br>(n=70) | 2021.22<br>(n=34) | 2022.23<br>(n=63) | 2023.24<br>(n=69) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Rubric Rating                                               | % (#)             | % (#)             | % (#)             | % (#)             | % (#)             |
| <b>Exemplary/Completed Continuous Improvement</b>           | 32% (21)          | 21% (15)          | 32% (11)          | 27% (17)          | 44.9% (31)        |
| <b>Effective/Initiated Continuous Improvement</b>           | 54% (36)          | 60% (42)          | 68% (23)          | 65% (41)          | 49.3% (34)        |
| <b>Developing/Engaged</b>                                   | 12% (8)           | 19% (13)          | 0% (0)            | 8% (5)            | 4.3% (3)          |
| <b>Insufficient/No Evidence</b>                             | 2% (1)            | 0% (0)            | 0% (0)            | 0% (0)            | 1.4% (1)          |
| <b>Total Administrative Units Rated Effective or Higher</b> | <b>86% (57)</b>   | <b>81% (57)</b>   | <b>100% (34)</b>  | <b>92% (58)</b>   | <b>94.2% (69)</b> |

\*Rubric titles revised for 2023-24.

**Table 2: Rubric Scores by Division (2023.24)**

| Rubric Rating                                 | % (#)            | % (#)           | % (#)             | % (#)             |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                               | 1<br>No Evidence | 2<br>Engaged    | 3<br>Initiated    | 4<br>Completed    |
| <b>Academic Affairs (9)</b>                   | 11% (1)          | 0% (0)          | 22% (2)           | 66% (6)           |
| <b>Diversity and Inclusion (9)</b>            | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 45% (4)           | 55% (5)           |
| <b>Enrollment Management (6)</b>              | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 66% (4)           | 33% (2)           |
| <b>Finance and Administration (10)</b>        | 0% (0)           | 10% (1)         | 30% (3)           | 60% (6)           |
| <b>Marketing and Communications (5)</b>       | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 80% (4)           | 20% (1)           |
| <b>Government and Community Relations (3)</b> | 0% (0)           | 33% (1)         | 33% (1)           | 33% (1)           |
| <b>NTID (3)</b>                               | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 100% (3)          | 0% (0)            |
| <b>Student Affairs (18)</b>                   | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 50% (9)           | 50% (9)           |
| <b>University Advancement (3)</b>             | 0% (0)           | 33% (1)         | 66% (2)           | 0%(0)             |
| <b>University Studies (3)</b>                 | 0% (0)           | 0% (0)          | 66% (2)           | 33% (1)           |
| <b>University Rubric Rating</b>               | <b>1.4% (1)</b>  | <b>4.3% (3)</b> | <b>49.3% (34)</b> | <b>44.9% (31)</b> |

**Table 3: Sample Goals Aligned to the Strategic Plan**

| Strategic Plan Dimension | % (86)*  | Unit Goal Aligned to the Strategic Plan                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------|----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>People</b>            | 57% (49) | <b>NTID's Office of Admissions:</b> Provide deaf and hard-of-hearing students with outstanding and inclusive state-of-the-art technical and professional education programs to level the playing field in the world of employment. |
| <b>Places</b>            | 8% (7)   | <b>Auxiliary Services:</b> Improve accessibility and inclusivity within dining operations by leveraging technology and strategic planning of operational layouts.                                                                  |
| <b>Partnerships</b>      | 13% (11) | <b>University Communications:</b> Amplify the RIT story through integration of marketing and communications while deploying innovative approaches to storytelling and engagement across Earned Media.                              |
| <b>Programs</b>          | 22% (19) | The <b>Center for Teaching and Learning:</b> Promote excellence in teaching by championing an effective and innovative teaching culture.                                                                                           |

\*Administrative units could select more than one Strategic Plan Dimension

The following examples highlight how administrative units used data to inform decisions or guide changes that lead to departmental and institutional improvements. Thank you to Katie Buckley of the Center for Residence Life, Kurt Ingerick, Emily Click, Dustin Johnson and McLean Bulmer of Auxiliary Services and Karen Liljequist, Joan Naturale, Grey Pasiak, and Ryan Tolnay from RIT Libraries.

**Table 4: Continuous Improvement Highlights**

| Highlight 1: Finance and Administration: Auxiliary Services                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Student Auxiliary Services</b> strives to increase accessibility and inclusivity within dining operations to improve the student dining experience. Accessible kiosk ordering stations were added to leverage technology and increase efficiency in the ordering process. Following implementation of the kiosks, several strategies were used to learn if the upgrades made the ordering process more accessible to all students. This included gathering feedback from faculty, staff, and students and engaging with customers as well as analyzing completed transactions and revenue. Student Auxiliary Services found:</p> <p>Operational efficiency improved significantly as peak-hour customer capacity increased by 12+ transactions per quarter-hour.</p> <p>Feedback from the NTID community noted the facility's transformation from "zero to hero" in terms of accessibility.</p> <p>Overall, the efforts led to significant improvements in accessibility, efficiency, and customer satisfaction while laying the groundwork for future campus-wide enhancements. This project's success will be used as a model for future enhancements to RIT Dining locations across campus.</p> |

## Highlight 2: Student Affairs, Residence Life

The **Center Residence Life** provides opportunities for residential students to establish a feeling of connection at RIT. Residence Life launched a Back to the Community initiative to support Residence Coordinators (RCs), the professional staff who live and work in the residence halls, in building relationships with students. Efforts included gathering in lobbies, open office hours and increased presence of RCs. These intentional efforts resulted in a 100% increase from the prior year in the percent of residence hall students responding that they felt connected to their RC. The department will continue to empower professional RCs to lead initiatives on fostering connections, and give them the autonomy to design and implement programs and outreach efforts.

## Highlight 3: Academic Affairs, RIT Libraries

**RIT Libraries** collaborated with the University Writing Program to support information literacy instruction and teach students to effectively use library resources. Librarians worked with writing instructors to understand perceived knowledge gaps to be addressed during library instruction and developed programming to help students learn academic research skills. Student feedback was collected and analyzed to identify and implement improvement steps after each semester. In the most recent survey, 97% of student respondents found the sessions to be either very helpful or helpful. Overall, this partnership was highly successful in engaging faculty and librarians in enhancing accessibility and student understanding of library research.

## Reflections, Recommendations, and Next Steps

The results from the IE Progress Report 9 demonstrate engagement with administrative unit assessment across the university. The revised instrument and process resulted in positive changes to the quality of submissions as well as a greater buy in among unit leaders for the need to participate in an annual IE Progress Report. Evidence of this comes in the form of feedback and timely submissions. The UAC will continue to use the current instrument and process but has identified additional areas for improvement. Next steps and recommendations are summarized below:

**Process:** The IE Progress Report review process demonstrated increased efficiency, with the majority of departments submitting reports on time. UAC reps scored reports for a randomized set of departments, then read their own division reports to validate the external reviewer rating. A new process was used with Google Drive which will be revisited and possibly revised for next year.

**Practice:** Not all units were able to demonstrate data-driven continuous improvement. More support and training are needed as unit leaders complete reports in order to ensure that all reports are scored *Initiated Continuous Improvement* or better. Further, some units' leaders need assistance in developing a quality Institutional Effectiveness Map that can guide their continuous improvement efforts. As a next step, the Office of EEA will prioritize training for UAC representatives as well as offering assistance to units in all divisions.

**Oversight:** Effective oversight of university assessment practices across RIT's nine diverse divisions remains a challenge. The UAC recommends that the committee be charged by the President to provide leadership across divisions and that the work of UAC be aligned with University priorities including the RIT Strategic Plan.

## 2024-2025 University Assessment Council Members

### *Academic Affairs*

Leah Bradley (Co-chair)  
Director of Educational Effectiveness Assessment

### *Student Affairs*

Jennifer Maltby (Co-chair)  
Director of Data, Analytics, and Planning

### *Academic Affairs*

Kathryn Scahill  
Assistant Director of Educational Effectiveness Assessment

### *University Studies*

James Hall  
Dean of University Studies and Executive Director SOIS

### *Diversity and Inclusion*

Teresa Long  
Director of Assessment and Research Management

### *Enrollment Management*

Meaghan Drumm  
Assistant Vice President Financial Aid and Scholarships

### *Finance and Administration*

Nilay Sapio  
Director of Institutional Research, Data, and Analytics

### *Government and Community Relations*

Maya Temperley  
Associate Vice President, Government and Community Relations

### *Marketing and Communications*

Denise Wellin  
Senior Marketing Data Analyst

### *National Technical Institute for the Deaf*

Richard Dirmyer  
Assistant Vice President Institutional Analytics and Assessment

### *RIT Dubai*

Dezzil Castelino  
Institutional Effectiveness Manager

### *University Advancement*

Teah Terrance  
Assistant Vice President, Alumni and Constituent Engagement