SUNY COUNCIL ON ASSESSMENT
Assessing Institutional Effectiveness Self-Assessment

Background: The SUNY Council on Assessment (SCOA) was established to support SUNY campuses in their efforts to assess institutional effectiveness and student learning outcomes. In fulfillment of that charge, SCOA has developed this self-assessment rubric focused on institutional effectiveness. The idea to design a rubric for this purpose took inspiration from a self-assessment rubric designed by Linda Suskie, and grew out of a compilation study of commendations, suggestions, and recommendations of Middle States accreditation reviews of SUNY campuses between 2010 and 2012. In all, 26 decennial team visits, 6 follow-up visits, and 9 Periodic Review Reports were examined for appraisals of how these institutions were addressing the assessment of institutional effectiveness. From that study, it became clear that campuses would benefit from having a tool that they could apply to their own institutions in order to gauge how they were doing in this area. An analytic rubric seemed the best way to present the various aspects of assessing institutional effectiveness. Since this rubric was designed as an institutional self-assessment tool, it is intended to serve more in a formative function rather than a summative one. It can be used to shine a spotlight on areas of institution-level assessment that may need improvement in order to advance overall institutional effectiveness. The rubric may also reveal how well an institution is "closing the loop" by questioning how well assessment findings are used in planning and resource allocation. This rubric was not designed for the comparison of institutions, either within or outside of SUNY. Nor was it designed to ensure that an institution has achieved the standards set forth by Middle States. It was designed in the spirit of the assessment movement, for the use by institutions for their own self- improvement.

Interpretative Notes: The language used throughout the rubric was intended to be applied flexibly to the very different parts and levels of organization that form the structure of colleges and universities. Thus, the terms "area" and "unit" were meant as a generic terms for any institutional organizational entity (e.g., different divisions, programs, departments, etc.). Similarly, the term "outcome" must be understood as relative to the particular area or unit that is being examined. In some instances, depending on the department or unit, the term "outcome" may refer to student learning outcomes. In other instances, outcomes other than student learning outcomes may be the focus. The intended meanings of the terms attached to the four levels of the scale also warrant comment. These labels were chosen to convey degrees of institutional progress toward assessment-related goals, and the labels are approximations at best. "Not evident" suggests assessment-related work is mostly or entirely absent. "Emerging" implies such work is underway, possibly newly created, but still largely piecemeal in its manifestation and with no overall institutional coordination/support. "Proficient" means the institution is doing a competent job with assessment, but there are still slight gaps/deficiencies. "Excelling" is meant to capture the point at which an institution has a thorough and accomplished process in place. Of course, to say that it is "accomplished" does not mean assessment is done. We are all well aware that assessment is a recurring process in the service of continual institutional improvement. In that same spirit, this rubric is likely to be a continually evolving document. Suggestions for improvement can be directed to the developers via www.sunyassess.org.

Directions: For each row in the rubric, select the level (0, 1, 2, or 3) that most accurately describes the current state of your institution. Optimal results may be obtained by requesting that a broad range of campus constituencies complete the rubric, and then using the results for discussion and planning.

This page left blank intentionally to facilitate back-to-back printing of the rubric.

SCOA INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RUBRIC

Aspect	Element	Goal	Level 0: Not Evident	Level 1: Emerging	Level 2: Proficient	Level 2: Excelling
Design	Plan	The institution has a formal assessment plan that documents an organized, sustained assessment process covering all major administrative units, student support services, and academic programs.	There is no overall institutional plan for assessment. Assessment may be conducted at the institution, but when it occurs, it is completed on an ad hoc basis, perhaps in response to specific challenges.	Some, but not all functional areas/units conduct assessment systematically and these have policies and plans that pertain to assessment within the area/unit; there is no coordination of or standards for assessment set by the institution.	All functional areas/units conduct assessment systematically and may have written policies to guide the process. There is no overall institutional plan that serves to coordinate use of assessment data to improve institutional effectiveness.	There is a written plan that specifies responsibility for conducting assessment at both unit and institution levels and that identifies reporting timelines and procedures. The plan also indicates how assessment data is channeled into the strategic planning and budgeting process.
Design	Outcomes	Measurable outcomes have been articulated for the institution as a whole and within functional areas/units, including for courses and programs and nonacademic units.	Outcomes either have not been written, or where they do exist, they are not stated in ways that directly suggest how to measure them.	Some but not all units have their own outcomes statements. For example, academic affairs may have identified student learning outcomes, but no other units have identified outcomes.	All units have outcomes statements, but not all of these are stated in terms that link to measurement operations.	All units within the institution and the institution as a whole have clearly stated and measurable outcomes.
Design	Alignment	More specific subordinate outcomes (e.g., course) are aligned with broader, higher-level outcomes (e.g., program) within units and these are aligned with the institutional mission, goals, and values.	Course/program or other functional area outcomes, when present, are not mapped to or aligned with higher level outcomes nor are they shown to be related to institutional mission, goals, and values.	Alignment of outcomes has been achieved in some but not all areas/units.	Alignment of lower level outcomes to higher level outcomes within areas/units is mostly complete. Alignment of higher levels unit outcomes to institutional mission, goals, and values is not complete.	All units indicate how their outcomes are aligned with institution mission, goals, and values. Alignment within units is specific and appropriate to the unit and its role in the institution. Alignment of outcomes indicates a strong sense of shared purpose within the institution.
Implementation	Resources	Financial, human, technical, and/or physical resources are adequate to support assessment.	No resources are available to support assessment.	Resources to support assessment are handled on an ad hoc basis.	There is budgetary support of assessment activities within units that conduct assessment, but there is no overall institutional plan for providing the full range of resources to support assessment.	The institution and each area/unit has made a commitment to assessment and provides all necessary resources for assessment.
Implementation	Culture	All members of the faculty and staff are involved in assessment activities.	Assessment, if occurring, is done by lone individuals charged with assessment responsibilities.	Some units involve faculty/staff in assessment planning and collection and review of data.	All units involve all faculty/staff in some aspect of assessment, planning data collection, and/or review of data.	All members of the university community are involved in assessment activities in their respective units. Institution leaders frequently articulate assessment as an important value/activity of the institution.
Implementation	Data Focus	Data from multiple sources and measures are considered in assessment.	Assessment data are not collected.	Assessment data are collected in one or more units but consists primarily of survey results and/or anecdotal evidence.	All units collect some combination of direct and indirect evidence to assess performance.	Assessment is based on, where appropriate, multiple measures of performance, including direct and indirect measures and quantitative and qualitative data.

SCOA INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS RUBRIC

Aspect	Element	Goal	Level 0: Not Evident	Level 1: Emerging	Level 2: Proficient	Level 2: Excelling
Implementation	**Sustainability**	Assessment is conducted regularly, consistently, and in a manner that is sustainable over the long term.	The institution cannot document that there is sustainable assessment activity occurring within any functional responsibility areas (academic, student services/support and administrative offices).	The institution can document that sustainable assessment activity is regularly occurring within several units of the institution, but assessment practices are either not universal or not sustainable for the long term.	Assessment is routinely conducted in most, if not all, units. The sustainability of the assessment activity varies in terms of how regularly it occurs or in how systematically outcomes/goals are assessed. Assessment activity is becoming a regular part of each unit's functioning.	Assessment is routinely conducted in all appropriate units. The sustainability of the assessment activity is evident in that assessment occurs regularly and systematically and has been ongoing for many years. Assessment activity is a regular part of each unit's functioning.
	Monitoring	Mechanisms are in place to systematically monitor the implementation of the assessment plan.	There is little or no evidence that the institution has in place or is developing effective systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities within and across units.	Assessment plans are in place. Systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities is occurring within some units, but not others. There is little evidence of institutional level monitoring of assessment activities.	Systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities is occurring within most, if not all, units. The institution has begun establishing a means for ensuring that all units regularly conduct and report assessment activities.	There is evidence of systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities within all units. The institution has an established mechanism for monitoring unit compliance with institutional assessment policies.
Impact	**Communication**	Assessment results are readily available to all parties with an interest in them.	Assessment results, if they exist, "live" in the individual unit and are not broadly communicated.	Assessment results are owned by the functional area and are shared with others on an as-needed basis.	Units within the institution share assessment results routinely with each other or make them accessible to others within the institution. Public disclosure of appropriate assessment data is limited.	Assessment results are disseminated to appropriate audiences at appropriate times; data appropriate to external audiences are available in easily accessible public domains; data needed for internal decision making are readily accessible to decision makers.
	Strategic Planning and Budgeting	Assessment data are routinely considered in strategic planning and budgeting.	Assessment data stay within the area in which they were collected. They do not factor into institutional strategic planning and budgeting.	One or more units use assessment results in budgetary requests and/or to inform strategic planning.	Assessment data are used in strategic planning and budgeting, but there is no clear mechanism in place to ensure this is accomplished routinely.	Institution is able to demonstrate that strategic planning and budgeting processes have routinely used assessment data in decision making.
	Closing the Loop	Assessment data have been used for institutional improvement.	There is little or no evidence that assessment results are used for institutional improvement.	There is evidence that assessment results are occasionally used for institutional improvement.	There is evidence that all units regularly use assessment results to inform improvements.	There is an institutional commitment to using assessment results to inform improvements; all units regularly use assessment data to close the loop; the institution presents evidence that assessment results, including student learning assessment, are routinely used for institutional improvement, effectiveness and planning.