



Rubric for Assessing Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

Program Name: _____ Iteration #: _____ Date: _____

*Instructions: Please use this rubric to reflect on your draft PLOs. You may wish to complete this individually and then share as a group to generate discussions around strengths and aspects that need further work. In Part 1, check the appropriate box (yes or no) whether the **PLOs overall** meet the 5 criteria (Number, Domains, Scope, Vetted, Shareable) and add corresponding notes to qualify your answer. In Part 2, write in your PLOs, **reflect on each PLO individually** with respect to all 4 criteria (Focus, Construction, Language, Usability), and add corresponding observations for “strengths” and “actions to improve.”*

PART 1: Reflecting on the overall list of PLOs		
Criteria	YES	NO
Number: List of total PLOs consist of at least 5 PLOs and no more than 20.		
Domains:* List reflects both low and high-order skills or all domains in chosen framework.		
Scope: List covers full range of learning achieved in program; is devoid of redundancies; includes institutional priorities and any relevant accreditation or other external professional/educational standards.		
Vetted: List has been reviewed by stakeholders & revised using feedback.		
Shareable: List is ready to be published on website as clear description of what students will achieve in this program.		
<small>*Domains are the types of learning that you have collectively decided would be the most relevant and appropriate for your program. These can include adaptations of domains from various frameworks of learning (Bloom’s Taxonomy, Fink’s Taxonomy of Significant Learning, 6 Facets of Understanding, etc.), existing typologies (HEQCO, Degree Qualifications Profile, AAC&U VALUE rubrics), or other knowledge/skill/disposition/perspective-based categories.</small>		

PART 2: Reflecting on each individual PLO

PLO #: Statement	Criteria	Strengths	Actions to Improve
	<p>Focus: Is student-centered not teaching-centered; aligned with needs of students, courses, program, and degree; transferable to other contexts outside the institution</p>		
	<p>Construction: Has an operational verb (preferably limited to 1 behaviour) with statement that explains what students can do or how they approach a task and the context in which they demonstrate it</p>		
	<p>Language: Uses clear and easy-to-understand language for all stakeholders (no jargon, acronyms, product names); balances being too detailed (CLO) vs. too generic (not discipline-specific)</p>		
	<p>Usability: Describes something measurable (consider the mapping scale) & demonstratable; attainable by students within scope of the program; includes realistic targets for milestones, frequency indicators, and/or end-goal; can be mapped to courses in the program</p>		

PART 2: Reflecting on each individual PLO

PLO #: Statement	Criteria	Strengths	Actions to Improve
	<p>Focus: Is student-centered not teaching-centered; aligned with needs of students, courses, program, and degree; transferable to other contexts outside the institution</p>		
	<p>Construction: Has an operational verb (preferably limited to 1 behaviour) with statement that explains what students can do or how they approach a task and the context in which they demonstrate it</p>		
	<p>Language: Uses clear and easy-to-understand language for all stakeholders (no jargon, acronyms, product names); balances being too detailed (CLO) vs. too generic (not discipline-specific)</p>		
	<p>Usability: Describes something measurable (consider the mapping scale) & demonstratable; attainable by students within scope of the program; includes realistic targets for milestones, frequency indicators, and/or end-goal; can be mapped to courses in the program</p>		

PART 2: Reflecting on each individual PLO

PLO #: Statement	Criteria	Strengths	Actions to Improve
	<p>Focus: Is student-centered not teaching-centered; aligned with needs of students, courses, program, and degree; transferable to other contexts outside the institution</p>		
	<p>Construction: Has an operational verb (preferably limited to 1 behaviour) with statement that explains what students can do or how they approach a task and the context in which they demonstrate it</p>		
	<p>Language: Uses clear and easy-to-understand language for all stakeholders (no jargon, acronyms, product names); balances being too detailed (CLO) vs. too generic (not discipline-specific)</p>		
	<p>Usability: Describes something measurable (consider the mapping scale) & demonstratable; attainable by students within scope of the program; includes realistic targets for milestones, frequency indicators, and/or end-goal; can be mapped to courses in the program</p>		

PART 2: Reflecting on each individual PLO

PLO #: Statement	Criteria	Strengths	Actions to Improve
	<p>Focus: Is student-centered not teaching-centered; aligned with needs of students, courses, program, and degree; transferable to other contexts outside the institution</p>		
	<p>Construction: Has an operational verb (preferably limited to 1 behaviour) with statement that explains what students can do or how they approach a task and the context in which they demonstrate it</p>		
	<p>Language: Uses clear and easy-to-understand language for all stakeholders (no jargon, acronyms, product names); balances being too detailed (CLO) vs. too generic (not discipline-specific)</p>		
	<p>Usability: Describes something measurable (consider the mapping scale) & demonstratable; attainable by students within scope of the program; includes realistic targets for milestones, frequency indicators, and/or end-goal; can be mapped to courses in the program</p>		

PART 2: Reflecting on each individual PLO

PLO #: Statement	Criteria	Strengths	Actions to Improve
	<p>Focus: Is student-centered not teaching-centered; aligned with needs of students, courses, program, and degree; transferable to other contexts outside the institution</p>		
	<p>Construction: Has an operational verb (preferably limited to 1 behaviour) with statement that explains what students can do or how they approach a task and the context in which they demonstrate it</p>		
	<p>Language: Uses clear and easy-to-understand language for all stakeholders (no jargon, acronyms, product names); balances being too detailed (CLO) vs. too generic (not discipline-specific)</p>		
	<p>Usability: Describes something measurable (consider the mapping scale) & demonstratable; attainable by students within scope of the program; includes realistic targets for milestones, frequency indicators, and/or end-goal; can be mapped to courses in the program</p>		