



Redesigning Math Pathways Self-Assessment Rubric

This tool is designed for system and institution leaders to self-assess how redesigned math pathway efforts are being developing across their system or institution. The tool focuses on areas that are key to the early stages of redesigning math pathways, including:

- **Goals**
- **Leadership**
- **Taking Inventory**
- **Administrative Support**
- **Examining Institutional Culture**
- **Mobilizing Through Effective Communication**

It is intended to be a resource in the design or improvement of redesigned math pathways initiatives at the system or institutional levels. We hope to continuously improve this document based on the engagement and feedback of our community members. Questions, comments, and feedback should be shared with Jonathan Gagliardi, Deputy Director of the National Association of System Heads, at jonathan@nash-dc.org.

What?	Key Questions	Nascent (1)	Developed (4)
Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has the system/institution clearly expressed its goals related to redesigning math pathways? - Has the system/institution broadcast those goals to internal and external stakeholders? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system/institution hasn't set a clear goal - The system/institution hasn't shared its goal with internal and external stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system/institution has a clearly defined goal for the positive impact of the effort - The system/institution has obtained support from an array of internal and external stakeholders
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there commitment among system/institution leaders committed? - Does the system/institution have a well-defined leadership team for the initiative? - Are system and institution leaders of the efforts well connected? - Have external champions been identified who can drive change? - Has the system selected a person who will responsible for the organization and logistics of the team? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is uneven commitment to the effort among System/institution leaders - Ownership of redesigning math pathway efforts is murky - Key leaders are disconnected and unable to leverage one another - No group of external stakeholders have been identified, or those who have lack the ability to drive change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System/institution leaders are committed to the effort - There are clear channels of responsibility and points of accountability within and outside of the organization - Key leaders are well connected and leverage each other to coordinate efforts - A group of external stakeholders who have the capacity to drive change have been identified and are engaged
Taking Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has the system/institution taking the time to identify work currently underway? - Is the system/institution aware of support and opposition, and opportunities and challenges? - Has the system/institution identified bright and dark spots to focus early adoption efforts? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There have been few efforts to understand the current system/institution landscape 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system/institution has completed an inventory of existing efforts and understands what can be augmented and what must either be created/changed/dropped - The system/institution has a clear sense of the support and opposition, as well as the opportunities and challenges related to the effort - The system/institution has identified where early adoption efforts hold the greatest potential for success

What?	Key Questions	Nascent (1)	Developed (4)
Administrative Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have key leaders/administrators (Chancellor/Presidents/VP's) voiced support? - Have administrators put efforts to redesign math pathways within the broader context of student success? - Is senior administration making resources available for these efforts? - Have administrators given team members adequate release time from their normal duties? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little or no support has been voiced by system and institutional leaders, and it is unclear if there is consensus surrounding the effort - Efforts have not been contextualized and framed as being complementary to ongoing efforts - Resources have not been made available, and this effort will have to compete with others - Team members are expected to do this in addition to their normal duties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - System and institutional leaders have voiced their support in unison, making it clear that this effort is a priority - The system and institutions see have clearly outlined and communicated why this effort complements work already underway - Dedicated resources have been made available for this effort - Team members have been engaged in a dialogue about the additional lift and have been released from other duties of lesser priority as appropriate
Examining Institutional Culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the system understand each campus culture, and where there are similarities and differences? - Has system identified past efforts that have fallen short of expectations, and taken the time to understand why? - Does the system understand its institutions capacities to take on this project? Has the system identified where it can provide the greatest value to institutions interested in undertaking this effort? - Does the system understand how math departments make decisions about instituting a new program or innovation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The system is largely unaware of the cultures and contexts of each of the participating institutions - The system has not reflected on past efforts at innovation and has little understanding of what has worked and what hasn't in the past - There is little understanding of the strengths and areas of improvement for each institution. As such, the system is largely unaware of how it can add contextualized value for this effort - There is no awareness of the institution and departmental level procedures related to new programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cultures and contexts of each of the participating institutions are well understood - Reasons for successes and failures of previous innovations are understood and have been embedded into planning - There is a strong understanding of the strengths and potential areas of improvement for each institution. As such, the system understands how it can add contextualized value for this effort - Institution and department level procedures for new programs have been well chronicled and incorporated into planning

What?	Key Questions	Nascent (1)	Developed (4)
Mobilizing through effective communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is there a clear outreach and communication plan that is contextualized to stakeholders? - Have feedback loops been embedded into the communication plan to facilitate refinement? - Have communications toolkits been designed for key stakeholders to engage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Communications are scattered and inconsistent, and not framed in contextualized ways - There are no feedback loops embedded and alternative stakeholder perspectives aren't embedded into planning - There are no communication kits put together that allow engaged stakeholders to easily engage in advocacy and planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There has been a clear communication and engagement plan that engages multiple stakeholders in contextualized ways - Feedback loops have been embedded to ensure that all parties are engaged in unique ways, and feedback is incorporated into revised strategic planning - As part of the communication plan, kits have been created that allow engaged stakeholders to answer key questions from their perspective