**Assessment Progress Report**

**Department: Academic Year:**

The purpose of the **Self-Assessment Rubric** is to serve as a guide for discussion in your department or program towards a strong foundation for sustainable assessment practice.

**Self-Assessment Rubric:** Mark one category per row and include evidence for each element referenced.

| **Capacity Criteria** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Needs Work** | ***Notes / Attachments*** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Course Learning Objectives** in place |  All courses offered by the department include course learning objectives that are student-centered, observable and aligned with assignments. |   All courses offered by the department include course learning objectives, but not all are student-centered, observable and aligned with assignments. |  Not all departmental courses have student learning objectives. | *Link to archive of sample syllabi* |
| **Program Learning Objectives** in place |  Each departmental program has program learning objectives that are student-centered, observable and aligned with courses. |  Each program has learning objectives, but not all are student-centered, observable and aligned with courses. |  Not all departmental programs have overall learning outcomes. | *Program Learning Outcomes Document* |
| **Curriculum Map** in place |  The department clearly aligns curricular offerings to program-specific learning objectives. |  The department ties curricular offerings to levels of learning, but not yet to program-specific learning objectives. |  The department does not yet explicitly tie curricular offerings to program learning objectives. | *Curriculum Map Document* |
| **General Education (CUNY Pathways) Student Learning Outcomes** in place |  All courses offered by the department that have a Pathways designation have integrated and aligned the appropriate Pathways SLOs with course materials. |  All courses offered by the department that have a Pathways designation have the appropriate SLOs on the syllabus, but they are not yet aligned with assignments. |  The department or program has courses with Pathways designations without integrating the appropriate course learning outcomes. | *Link to archive of sample syllabi* |
| **Assessment Methods** in place |  The department has developed assessment methods that effectively convey information about how well students are meeting learning outcomes, about program support for students and DEI, and alumni outcomes. |  The department has developed program assessment methods, but they do not yet follow best practices. |  The department has not yet developed methods to assess student learning or support. | *List of assessment methods and dates in use (Assessment Grid, below)* |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Capacity Criteria** | **Developed** | **Emerging** | **Needs Work** | ***Notes / Attachments*** |
| **Assessment Plan** in place |  The department has a plan in place aimed at assessing all program learning objectives over time, and includes goals, strategies, resources and a timeline. |  The department has an assessment plan, but it is not structured to systematically assess all program learning objectives (e.g., is primarily focused on short-term or discrete projects). |  The department does not yet have a plan to assess its program learning objectives. | *Assessment Plan Document* |
| **Re-Assessment of Changes Made** in place |  The department regularly re-assesses the changes that were made during previous assessment cycles by collecting and analyzing data that compares current outcomes to outcomes before the changes.  |  The department sometimes collects and analyzes data to determine if changes made during previous assessment cycles have impacted outcomes but this is informal or inconsistent. |  Changes are made during the assessment cycle but the changes are not re-assessed to determine their effectiveness in improving student outcomes. | *Assessment Action Plans and Final Reports completed as part of Assessment Results Reports* |
| **Level of Inclusivity** in departmental assessment activities |  Coordinated efforts are made to include all department members in conversations around assessment and to take a collaborative approach to articulate learning objectives, and implement change.  |  Some effort is made to include all members of the department in conversations around assessment; coordinated efforts are piecemeal. |  Little effort is made to include all members of the department in conversations around assessment; there is no coordinated effort yet. | *Description of coordinated department or program assessment efforts.* |
| **Level of engagement** with QC’s assessment community and resources\* |  The department demonstrates high engagement with campus assessment groups and resources. |  The department demonstrates moderate engagement with campus assessment groups and resources |  The department demonstrates little to no engagement with campus assessment groups and resources. | *List of faculty members’ participation with assessment groups, activities and/or resources.* |
| **Assessment support** in place, including leadership, committees, dedicated faculty, funding |  The department has resources in place, including faculty leadership on assessment, to effectively support assessment practice. |  The department has some resources, but they are not yet sufficient to support assessment activities sustainably. |  The department does not yet have resources in place to support assessment activities. | *List of supports, including leadership, dedicated faculty, funding.* |
| **Immediate future** of assessment practice |  The department has concrete plans for next steps with goals, roles and timelines. |  The department has plans for next steps but they are not yet clear or feasible. |  The department does not yet have plans for next steps or plans are stalled. | *List of next steps for assessment* |