**Purpose**: The goal of this rubric is to assess the effectiveness of York’s institutional effectiveness framework, processes and activities. The rubric outlines three aspects including assessment design, implementation and impact. For each element, there is a goal and a measure with four performance levels. Users should only select one performance level for each element.

|  **Aspect** | **Element** | **Goal** | **Measure** | **Level 0: Novice** | **Level 1: Emerging** | **Level 2: Proficient** | **Level 3: Exemplary** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Plan** | The institution has a formal assessment plan that documents an organized, sustained assessment process covering all academic programs including general education and administrative, educational and student support (AESS) units. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Outcomes)Institutional Effectiveness Plan | [ ] 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 programs and 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 programs and 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 datato improve institutional effectiveness. | [ ]  There is a written plan that specifies responsibility for conducting assessment at all levels including institution, program and unit level that identifies reporting timelines and procedures.The plan also indicates how assessment data are channeled into the strategic planning and budgeting process. |
| **Design** | **Outcomes** | Measurable outcomes have been articulated for the institution as a whole and within functional academic programs and AESS units. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Outcomes) | [ ]  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 programs and units have their own outcomes statements. For example, academic affairs may have identified student learningoutcomes, but no other units have identified outcomes. | [ ]  All programs and units within the institution and the institution as a whole have outcomes statements, but not all outcomes are measurable. | [ ]  All programs and units within the institution and the institution as a whole have clearly stated and measurable outcomes. |
|  | **Alignment** | Academic program and AESS unit outcomes are aligned with higher level outcomes such as institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) and/or strategic goals.  | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Outcomes) | [ ]  Program and unit outcomes are not aligned with higher level outcomes such as ILOs and/or strategic goals. | [ ]  Program and unit outcomes align with higher level outcomes such as ILOs and/or strategic goals has been achieved in some but not all academic programs and AESS units. | [ ]  Program and unit outcomes alignment with higher level outcomes such as ILOs and/or strategic goals is mostly complete.  | [ ]  All programs and unit outcomes are aligned with higher level outcomes such as ILOs and/or strategic goals. Alignment of outcomes indicates a strong sense of shared purpose within the institution. |
|  | **Resources** | Financial, human, technical, and/or physical resources are adequate to support assessment. | Budget reports | 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 programs/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 program and unit has made a commitment to assessment and provides necessary resources for assessment. |
| **Implementation** | **Culture** | All members of the faculty and staff are involved in assessment activities. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Processes)Survey | [ ]  Assessment, if occurring, is done by lone individuals charged with assessment responsibilities. | [ ]  Some programs and units involve faculty/staff in assessment planning and collection and review of data. | [ ]  All programs and units involve all faculty/staff in some aspect of assessment, planning data collection, and/or review of data. | [ ]  All members of the College community are involved in assessment activities in their respective areas. Institution leaders frequently articulate assessment as an important value/activity of the institution. |
|  | **Data Focus** | Data from multiple sources and measures are considered in assessment. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Outcomes) | [ ]  Assessment data are not collected. | [ ]  Assessment data are collected in one or more program and unit but consists primarily of indirect measures, e.g. survey results and/or anecdotal evidence. | [ ]  All programs and 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. |
|  | **Sustainability** | Assessment is conducted regularly, consistently, and in a manner that is sustainable over the long term in all academic programs, AESS units and at the institutional level. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports | [ ]  The institution cannot document that there is sustainable assessment activities occurring within any functional responsibility areas (academic programs and AESS units). | [ ]  The institution can document that sustainable assessment activities are regularly occurring within several programs and 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 program and unit’s functioning. | [ ]  Assessment is routinely conducted in all appropriate programs and units. The sustainability of the assessment activity is evident in that assessment occurs regularly and systematically and has been ongoing for many years. Assessment activities are a regular part of each program and unit’s functioning and the institution. |
| **Implementation**  | **Monitoring** | Mechanisms are in place to systematically monitor the implementation of the assessment plan. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Processes) | [ ]  There is little or no evidence that the institution has in place or is developing effective systematic monitoringof the quality and implementation of assessment activities within and across programs and units. | [ ]  Assessment plans are in place. Systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities isoccurring within some programs and 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 programs and units regularly conduct and report assessment activities. | [ ]  There is evidence of systematic monitoring of the quality and implementation of assessment activities within all programs and units. The institution has an established mechanism for monitoring program and unit compliance with institutional assessment policies. |
|  | **Communication** | Assessment results are readily available to all parties with an interest in them. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports Institutional assessment webpages | [ ]  Assessment results, if they exist, “live” in the individual program/unit and are not broadly communicated. | [ ]  Assessment results are owned by the functional program/unit area and are shared with others on an as-needed basis. | [ ]  Assessment results are routinely shared by the program/unit with each other and are 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. |
| **Impact** | **Strategic Planning and Budgeting** | Assessment data are routinely considered in strategic planning and budgeting. | Strategic annual action plans and reports | [ ]  Assessment data stay within the area in which they were collected. They do not factor into institutional strategic planning and budgeting. | [ ]  One or more program and unit uses 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. |
|  | **Use of Results** | Assessment data have been used for institutional improvement. | Assessment Committees Annual Reports (Patterns of Outcomes)  | [ ]  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 programs and units regularly use assessment results to inform improvements. | [ ]  There is an institutional commitment to using assessment results to inform improvements; all programs and 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. |