Verification of PLOs Assessment

Institution:	write here
College:	write here
Program:	write here
Visit Date:	From Click or tap to enter a date. To Click or tap to enter a date.

Verification of PLOs Assessment

The Review Panel will complete a detailed form regarding the Program Learning Outcome (PLOs) achievement. This form will document the courses or projects used to evaluate each PLO. Also, it is designed to capture essential details about how these courses or projects contribute to assessing the desired outcomes. Overall, the Review Panel should evaluate how students successfully achieved the POLs.

A. Verification of PLOs Assessment

PLOs	Related Course/Project Code	Related Course/Project Title	Level in the Study Plan	Related CLO	Assessment Method/Activity	Reviewer Evaluation*

*To be completed by the reviewer

B. PLOs' Evaluation Rubrics *,**

Criterion	Rating	Justification	Evidence (e.g. document and Page #)	What prevents the program from the next level	Reviewer Suggestions from remedies
PLO list	Choose an item.				
Assessable & Measurable	Choose an item.				
Aligned	Choose an item.				
Planned	Choose an item.				
Supported	Choose an item.				
Analyzed	Choose an item.				
Utilized	Choose an item.				

* From the Evaluation Rubrics (table) below
**To be completed by the reviewer

C. Summary of Reviewer's Evaluation

Role	Name	Signature	Date
Choose an item.			Click or tap to enter a date.
Choose an item.			Click or tap to enter a date.
Choose an item.			Click or tap to enter a date.
Choose an item.			Click or tap to enter a date.
Choose an item.			Click or tap to enter a date.

Evaluation Rubrics

Criterion	NC (1)	MC (2)	SC (3)	FC (4)
PLO list	A list of outcomes exists and reasonably numbered.	A list of outcomes exists, reasonably numbered, and serves the mission and the goals.	The list contains the required outcomes to satisfy the mission and the goals, clearly stated (action verb, context, …etc.), and reasonably numbered.	The list contains the required outcomes to satisfy the mission and the goals, clearly stated (action verb, context, …etc.), reasonably numbered and prioritized, and consistent.
Assessable & Measurable	Outcomes do not identify what students can do to demonstrate learning (vague, immeasurable verbs like "understand"). No rubric developed.	Outcomes indicate how students can demonstrate learning, but action verbs may be general. Rubric is not properly developed.	Outcomes describe how students can demonstrate learning, identifying observable and measurable results. Criteria are articulated in the form of rubric, criteria and standards may need further development to be more meaningful and consistently applied.	Outcomes specifically describe how students can demonstrate learning. Rubric clearly articulates explicit criteria and standards for assessment, identifies the most important aspects of student learning, and includes descriptions of student performance at varying levels.
Aligned	There is no clear relationship between the outcomes themselves and between the different levels of outcomes (course, program, school). The outcomes relevance to the curriculum is not clear.	The outcomes are somewhat consistent between the different levels (course, program, school) but not necessarily aligned. Their relevance to the curriculum is simple (direct statements, one-to-one statements).	The outcomes are consistent and serve all levels properly. Curriculum is served properly.	PLOs are highly aligned to reach the level expected from higher education consistently. Curriculum is approached from different angles with different levels of sophistications.
Planned	There is no formal plan for assessing each outcome.	The program relies on short-term planning, such as selecting which outcome(s) to assess in the current year without reasonable prioritization.	The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies when each outcome will be assessed. The plan may explicitly include analysis and implementation of improvements.	The program has a fully articulated, sustainable, multi-year assessment plan that describes when and how each outcome will be assessed and how improvements are based on findings will be implemented. The plan is routinely examined and revised, as needed.
Supported	It is not clear that potentially valid evidence is collected for the PLO.	Faculty have reached general agreement on the types of evidence to be collected for the PLO but may not include both direct and indirect forms or indirect assessment is collected or used improperly.	Faculty collect relevant & sufficient evidence for each outcome, including both indirect and direct evidence. Rubric assesses the level of student attainment.	Assessment criteria have been tested and refined over time, usually shared with students. Direct and indirect evidence are designed to mutually inform conclusions. Feedback has led to refinements in the assessment process.

Criterion	NC (1)	MC (2)	SC (3)	FC (4)
Analyzed	Results (data table or other means) are not used or not included in report.	Results (data table or other means) are improperly analyzed (incorrect tools or incorrect use of tools) or included but unclear or missing key data.	Results clearly delineated for each line of evidence in tabular or other summary formats. May reference benchmarks or other expectations. Proper tools are used.	Results clearly delineate each line of evidence, indicating various levels of achievement. Includes benchmarks.
Utilized	The report identifies implications but no recommendations for improvement in student learning or assessment practices and no explanation of how these claims are derived. No reasoning offered in support of claims.	Some conclusions, implications, and recommendations for improvements regarding student learning or assessment are included, but they are vague or questionably related to results. Support for claims is insufficient. Questions of validity or reliability are not discussed.	The report clearly articulates conclusions, implications and recommendations for improvement regarding both student learning and assessment, and which could be drawn from results. Includes some consideration of the reliability and validity of results. Results have been discussed by many faculty and recommendations likely to be implemented due to faculty involvement and support and quality of assessment work.	The report articulates a well-reasoned critique of conclusions, implications, and recommendations that could be drawn from the results for both student learning and assessment. Includes a well-reasoned discussion of validity and reliability of results. The faculty discusses results, plans needed changes, and implement changes. Efforts to collaborate with others, such as librarians or student affairs professionals, to improve results.