Brooklyn College Academic Assessment Rubric – Planning and Documentation (Formative)

| Score Levels | Learning Outcomes | Curriculum Mapping | Assessment Cycle | Tools |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exemplary | * A comprehensive list of learning outcomes has been developed
* Learning outcomes are clearly formulated and are universally expressed in measurable and observable terms
* Outcomes are well articulated and appear specific and measurable
 | * A curriculum map exists and documents indicate specifically that it is aligned with existing course offerings and path to graduation
* Curriculum map is consistently aligned with measurable and observable student learning outcomes
 | * An assessment cycle exists that is multi-year and based on a practical sequence of assessments which contains specific dates and can be realistically implemented by the department
* The plan can be adapted and added to for the future with minimal difficulty
 | * Multiple assessment tools are used to assess student learning beyond grades, and they are justified in terms reflecting best practices for the field. Both direct and indirect tools are used to help cross-validate their findings
* Tools are justified by department in terms of their validity, reliability, etc.
 |
| Satisfactory | * A list of learning outcomes has been developed
* Learning outcomes are clearly formulated and are mostly expressed in measurable and observable terms
* Learning outcomes are generally internally consistent, balanced, and aligned according to student learning level and curriculum
 | * A curriculum map exists and documents suggest that it is aligned with existing course offerings and path to graduation
* Curriculum map is generally if inconsistently aligned with student learning outcomes
 | * An assessment cycle exists that is multi-year and based on a practical sequence of assessments, though the scheduling details of that cycle may remain unclear
* The plan can generally be built on for future assessment plans
 | * Assessment tool(s) are used to assess student learning beyond grades, and they are generally aligned with best practices for a given field
* Tools are justified by department, but perhaps not in concrete terms
 |
| Developing | * Some learning outcomes have been articulated, but not in measurable and observable terms
* Outcomes lack consistency and balance and are not aligned with student learning level and curriculum
 | * A curriculum map exists, but no information is provided regarding whether it reflects existing course offerings or path to graduation for majors
* Curriculum map is generally not aligned with student learning outcomes
 | * An assessment cycle exist, but is generally ad hoc, tied to a limited accreditation schedule, and is not connected to previous plans or future plans
* The plan would have to be significantly altered to be useful in the future
 | * An assessment tool is used to assess student learning beyond grades, but it is not in keeping with best practices for a given field
* Department has largely failed to justify why tools are effective and appropriate
 |
| Initial | * No or inadequate learning outcomes articulated by the department
* Outcomes that have been articulated are not coherently formulated and are too vague or broad to be useful
 | * No curriculum map exists
 | * No assessment plan is in place, or plans that have been developed have no particular schedule or means of implementation
 | * Only grades or grade distributions are used to assess student learning
* Only the instructor of record for a given course is involved in assessing the effectiveness of that course
 |
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