



Exemplary Student Pathways

An initiative of The University of Texas System

Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

The Exemplary Student Pathways (ESP) Change Model defines *curricular redesign* as a comprehensive process of evaluating and transforming the structure, operations, content, and pedagogy of academic programs and courses. The primary goal is to provide students with learning experiences that equip them with the skills, knowledge, abilities, and habits of mind necessary for success in college, careers, and civic life. This is achieved through the development of clear degree pathways with well-defined learning outcomes resulting in curricula that are coherent and transparent.

Curricular redesign, as envisioned by the ESP Change Model, prioritizes students by fostering an inclusive educational environment that respects and reflects their diverse backgrounds and experiences. It involves reimagining pathways into and through majors, transforming entire majors, revising one or more courses within a major, or redesigning gateway courses that lead into degree programs.

This self-assessment tool is designed to help your institution evaluate its current adoption of curricular redesign practices as defined by the ESP Change Model. State agencies and other higher education organizations will also find the rubric helpful in thinking through their support for and facilitation of more student-centered pathways and degree completion.

Structure, operations, content, and pedagogy can be understood as the four **domains** of curricular redesign, *broad categories of assessment or evaluation*. Each domain includes a subset of **criteria**, *measurable components within each domain category that demonstrate whether the domain is present and to what extent*. Reflecting on the extent to which criteria are present enables teams and institutional leaders to determine areas of improvement, opportunity, and success.

The stages of adoption move from Not Present to Emerging to Established to Advanced. They are meant to be formative not judgmental, helping users to focus on iterative continuous improvement along a continuum. The Advanced stage represents the institutionalization of holistic curricular redesign as defined by the ESP Change Model. For many institutions, the Advanced stage may be aspirational given resources, culture, and other constraints.

Users are encouraged to review the Data Agency and Curricular Redesign User Guidance Document before engaging with the rubric. Some domains and criteria are cross-cutting, hence their inclusion in multiple domains. *Some items may not be applicable for every level or role; you should designate those with an "N/A"*

The level or role of this assessment. Select one only:

System or State Coordinator (for multiple institutions)
Institution or Agency or Organization
College/School

Department
Office
Team



Exemplary Student Pathways

An initiative of The University of Texas System

Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

Domain: Structure – Ensuring the curriculum sequence is transparent and positions students to enter, persist, and complete degrees.		
Criteria	Scale of Adoption	Rating
1. Degree Maps - Comprehensive degree maps illustrating clear course sequences are readily available and actively used by students, advisors, and faculty. These maps serve to reduce curricular barriers and complexity, ensuring both FTIC and transfer students understand their pathways to degree completion.	(1) Not Present: Degree maps are not available to students, advisors, or faculty. (2) Emerging: Degree maps are available but may be difficult to locate, not used consistently, or not updated regularly. (3) Established: Degree maps are accessible, easily located, and regularly used by students, advisors, and faculty, though they may not be up to date. (4) Advanced: In addition to accessibility and regular use, a standardized process is in place for maintaining degree maps, involving responsible units such as departments, advisors, curriculum committees, and registrars.	
2. Curricular Barriers – The institution leverages both quantitative and qualitative data to identify and analyze curricular barriers and complexities. This includes examining how students enter, progress through, pause, and complete academic programs. Insights from this data inform decisions to address gaps in outcomes and improve pathways.	(1) Not Present: There is no data or understanding of how students navigate majors, including entry, progress, stop-out, or completion patterns. (2) Emerging: Limited data or understanding exists, or plans are in place to gather data to better understand student navigation of majors. (3) Established: Data—quantitative and qualitative—is collected and analyzed, with findings used increasingly by groups of stakeholders to inform targeted improvements. (4) Advanced: Data is regularly collected, analyzed, widely communicated, and effectively used to drive continuous improvement efforts across the institution.	



Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

3. Interventions - Targeted, personalized interventions to support students are systematically offered by responsible units at multiple levels of the institution. These interventions ensure students can successfully start, stay on, and complete their academic pathways. (Examples of interventions include, but are not limited to, corequisite remediation, personalized advising, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring, and others.)	(1) Not Present: Targeted and personalized interventions or supports are not available to students. (2) Emerging: Interventions or supports have been identified but are either in pilot stages or implemented on a limited scale. (3) Established: Interventions or supports are implemented and an evaluation plan exists to measure efficacy and guide decisions on scaling them more widely across the curriculum or pausing them to redesign. (4) Advanced: Interventions or supports are implemented at scale and embedded in courses, programs, or pathways, with responsible units ensuring their sustainability. Evaluation plans for measuring impact and guiding decisions processes are institutionalized.	
4. Continuous Improvement - A structured process engages key stakeholders in ongoing assessment and improvement of curricular changes. This includes evaluating the impact of policies, strategies, tools, and practices, and making data-informed adjustments to enhance outcomes.	(1) Not Present: No formal process exists for evaluating or improving curricular redesign efforts. (2) Emerging: Continuous improvement frameworks are occasionally applied with limited stakeholder engagement and minimal shared responsibility. (3) Established: Continuous improvement frameworks are applied at the program or college level but lack both standardization and shared responsibility among relevant stakeholders across the institution. (4) Advanced: Institution-wide continuous improvement frameworks are applied systematically to evaluate and enhance curricular redesign efforts, with responsibility shared among relevant stakeholders across the institution.	
5. Add your own Institution or project-specific criteria	(1) Not Present: (2) Emerging: (3) Established: (4) Advanced:	



Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

Domain: Operations – Ensuring the curriculum is delivered in alignment with student needs and institutional capacity.		
Criteria	Scale of Adoption	Rating
1. Scheduling practices - The institution employs a transparent, robust strategy for class scheduling that maximizes student access to courses, with understanding of the different needs and enrollment patterns of student populations (e.g., students working full-time, parenting and military-affiliated students, etc.). Scheduling practices prioritize timely graduation by ensuring sufficient course sections, diverse delivery modes, and accessible times of day.	(1) Not Present: Scheduling practices do not prioritize maximizing student access or timely graduation. (2) Emerging: The institution recognizes course scheduling as a lever for increasing student access and is in the early stages of improving scheduling practices. (3) Established: Some areas of the institution use data to inform scheduling decisions, improving access and aligning with student needs and populations. (4) Advanced: Institution-wide policies and practices guide data-driven scheduling decisions to maximize access and support timely graduation for all students.	
2. Instructional capacity - Instructional capacity is aligned with institutional needs, ensuring adequate numbers of qualified faculty, appropriate instructional spaces, and necessary support to deliver the scheduled courses effectively. Attention is given to the unique role of adjunct faculty to ensure fairness and consistency in workloads, growth opportunities, and institutional support.	(1) Not Present: No strategic processes exist for assigning instructional faculty to courses or spaces. (2) Emerging: Some departments recognize the importance of strategic faculty assignments in high-stakes or high-enrollment courses and are developing criteria for assignments. (3) Established: Most departments use defined criteria for assigning instructors to high-stakes or high-enrollment courses and provide targeted support for these faculty and spaces. (4) Advanced: All departments have established criteria for assigning instructors to high-stakes or high-enrollment courses, supported by training, personnel, and technology to ensure instructional effectiveness.	



Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

3. Process Alignment - Processes within and across departments are coordinated to ensure consistency in course delivery. This includes alignment among instructors teaching the same courses and collaboration across departments to streamline operations.	(1) Not Present: No processes exist for aligning instructional practices within or across departments. (2) Emerging: Some processes exist for aligning instructional practices, but the processes are not widely recognized or valued. (3) Established: Regular coordination occurs within departments for vertical alignment across sequences and horizontal alignment across sections. (4) Advanced: Alignment and coordination processes are systematically applied within and across departments, ensuring consistent access and alignment for multi-department programs.	
4. Credit for Prior Learning - Processes are in place to evaluate, validate, and award credit for prior learning. This includes recognizing prior learning experiences such as dual credit, micro-credentials, and competency-based learning, credit by examination, and transfer credit providing students with clear pathways to integrate these credits into their degree programs.	(1) Not Present: Policies for evaluating and awarding CPL are inconsistently implemented or unclear. (2) Emerging: Transfer credit policies are consistently implemented, but CPL policies (e.g., credit-by-examination) are inconsistent or poorly communicated. (3) Established: Policies and practices for transfer and CPL are implemented and mostly clear, though some areas lack clarity regarding responsibilities. (4) Advanced: CPL policies and processes are clearly defined and consistently marketed, ensuring students and advisors understand how to evaluate and award CPL. Systems are in place to document CPL transparently and ensure consistent implementation within degree programs.	
5. Add your own Institution or project-specific criteria	(1) Not Present: (2) Emerging: (3) Established: (4) Advanced:	



Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

Domain: Content – Ensuring the curriculum is current, relevant, and responsive to student, disciplinary, career/workforce, and societal needs.		
Criteria	Scale of Adoption	Rating
1. Curriculum design - Design, adaptations, and regular reviews of curricula focus on addressing the evolving needs of the discipline, workforce, communities, and/or the broader society. Curriculum design should also consider the implications of generative AI for disciplinary relevance, workforce readiness, and ethical engagement.	(1) Not Present: No regular review process exists to refine the curriculum in response to disciplinary, workforce, or societal needs. (2) Emerging: Some elements of the curriculum address evolving needs, but efforts to review are inconsistent or limited in scope across disciplines. Initial steps are underway to develop a process for regular review in some programs. (3) Established: Most disciplines and programs have a review process in place to update curricula based on feedback from students, industry, and community stakeholders. Updates reflect evolving disciplinary and societal needs. (4) Advanced: Institution-wide, systematic processes ensure curricula are regularly reviewed and redesigned to meet current and emerging needs of students, disciplines, the workforce, and society. Comprehensive stakeholder input drives continuous improvement.	
2. Course and program-level learning outcomes - Measurable learning outcomes are articulated for courses and credentials aligned with disciplinary knowledge, industry-relevant skills, and societal needs.	(1) Not Present: Learning outcomes are not defined or measurable. No assessment processes exist. (2) Emerging: Some courses or programs articulate learning outcomes, but they are not consistently measurable or aligned with broader disciplinary or workforce needs. Efforts to assess outcomes are limited. (3) Established: Most courses and programs have well-defined, measurable learning outcomes aligned with content, disciplinary knowledge, and industry-relevant skills. Institution-wide assessment processes ensure regular review and improvement. (4) Advanced: Comprehensive, measurable learning outcomes are embedded across all courses and programs, consistently aligned with disciplinary and workforce needs. Assessment systems drive continuous improvement to close gaps in learning and enhance outcomes.	



Exemplary Student Pathways

An initiative of The University of Texas System

Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

3. Instructional materials - Access to high-quality, affordable, and accessible instructional materials, including Open Educational Resources and other digital resources, is ensured for students.	(1) Not Present: Instructional materials are not accessible, affordable, or aligned with quality standards. No improvement efforts are evident. (2) Emerging: Efforts to provide accessible and affordable materials exist but are inconsistent or limited. Initial steps are underway to expand access across more courses and programs. (3) Established: Most courses offer accessible, affordable, and relevant instructional materials. Institution-wide guidelines or policies ensure quality and accessibility standards are met. (4) Advanced: Institution-wide processes ensure all courses provide accessible, affordable, and high-quality materials. Regular updates and continuous feedback improve alignment with evolving needs, accessibility standards, and technological advancements.	
4. Post-graduation preparation - Content is embedded into courses that prepare students for civic engagement, careers, and meaningful societal participation, including, for example, experiential learning, micro credentials, and other short-term credentials.	(1) Not Present: Courses lack content to prepare students for civic, career, or societal participation. No efforts to embed such content are evident. (2) Emerging: Some courses incorporate relevant content, but efforts are limited and lack integration. Initial steps are underway to build infrastructure supporting student preparation. (3) Established: Engaged learning opportunities are embedded into many courses, but these are not consistently assessed to measure their value for student preparation post-graduation. (4) Advanced: Engaged learning opportunities are systematically embedded across the curriculum and regularly assessed to ensure students are prepared for civic, career, and societal participation.	
5. Add your own Institution or project-specific criteria	(1) Not Present: (2) Emerging: (3) Established: (4) Advanced:	



Exemplary Student Pathways

An initiative of The University of Texas System

Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

Domain: Pedagogy – Ensuring the curriculum is delivered well, ensures student engagement and learning, and includes appropriate support for instructors.		
Criteria	Scale of Adoption	Rating
1. Professional development - Tenure- and non-tenure stream instructors have access to professional development focused on course design and redesign, pedagogy, and student learning and success.	(1) Not Present: No institutional resources or commitment for professional development exist. (2) Emerging: Limited resources provide some instructors access to professional development opportunities. Faculty engagement is inconsistent. (3) Established: Substantial institution-wide resources ensure most instructors have access to professional development opportunities. Faculty consistently engage with professional development resources. (4) Advanced: Comprehensive, systematic professional development programs support all instructors, ensuring alignment with institutional goals for pedagogy and student success. Faculty engagement with professional development resources is institutionalized and valued, including as a part of the promotion and rewards system.	
2. Pedagogical approaches - Faculty ensure the curriculum is delivered effectively, fostering engagement and learning while receiving instructional support from the institution. Instructors are supported in adapting pedagogical practices to incorporate and/or respond to generative AI tools in ways that enhance learning and academic integrity.	(1) Not Present: Pedagogical strategies are not incorporated into course redesigns, and instructors lack guidance or training on these approaches. (2) Emerging: Some instructors and programs adopt active learning strategies, but efforts are inconsistent. Initial training opportunities are available to support adoption. (3) Established: Institution-wide support encourages adoption of evidence-based pedagogies in most redesign efforts, with professional development available for many instructors. Faculty adoption of these practices is documented and evaluated. (4) Advanced: Systematic institutional support embeds evidence-based pedagogies in all course redesigns. Professional learning opportunities are widely available to help all instructors adopt and refine these approaches. A robust process is in place to evaluate and enhance the adoption of pedagogical best practices, including as part of the promotion and rewards system.	



Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

3. Program-level Assessment - Integrated assessments that measure knowledge, skills, and readiness for civic and career engagement.	(1) Not Present: Assessments are not integrated into course redesign, and instructors receive no training or guidance in this area. (2) Emerging: Some courses include assessments aligned with knowledge, skills, or career readiness, but efforts are inconsistent, and institutional support is limited. (3) Established: Institution-wide systems support instructors in embedding assessments to measure learning outcomes. Continuous improvement processes refine assessment practices to address gaps in student learning. (4) Advanced: A culture of assessment is evident institution-wide, with robust systems to measure learning outcomes and inform continuous improvement. Assessments consistently close student success gaps.	
4. Accessibility and modality - Ensure instructional delivery includes accessible approaches and multiple modalities to support diverse learners and meet federal, state, and institutional accessibility standards.	(1) Not Present: Courses do not leverage digital technology or provide multiple modalities. Opportunities for flexible access are minimal. (2) Emerging: Some courses offer flexible modalities, but this is not a goal of curricular redesign. Efforts are limited in scope. (3) Established: Digital technology supports delivery in multiple modalities in redesigned courses, with efforts to increase access and flexibility. (4) Advanced: Redesigns systematically leverage digital technology to ensure multiple modalities and equitable access across the institution.	



Exemplary Student Pathways

An initiative of The University of Texas System

Curricular Redesign Self-Assessment Rubric

5. Learner profiles - Enable instructors to use student data to inform teaching practices and close gaps in student outcomes.	(1) Not Present: Instructors lack access to student data, and no institutional processes exist for using data to inform teaching. (2) Emerging: Basic data is available, and some instructors are analyzing it to address student success gaps. (3) Established: Regular access to comprehensive student data enables many instructors to modify teaching practices and improve student success outcomes. (4) Advanced: Systematic, data-informed practices drive teaching improvements across all courses. Gaps in outcomes are regularly addressed through department- and institution-level interventions.	
6. Student belonging - Foster inclusive classroom environments to enhance motivation, engagement, and success for all students.	(1) Not Present: Inclusive classroom practices are absent, and no data is collected on student belonging in the classroom. (2) Emerging: Basic inclusion strategies are implemented in some classrooms. Feedback collection efforts are minimal or inconsistent. (3) Established: Most instructors use evidence-based strategies to foster inclusion, with regular feedback showing improvement in belonging across all student populations. (4) Advanced: All instructors systematically implement and assess inclusion practices, with data showing strong engagement and belonging across classrooms.	
7. Add your own Institution or project-specific criteria.	(1) Not Present: (2) Emerging: (3) Established: (4) Advanced:	