Checklist for Effective OBT Short term Curriculum Development/review & Evaluation

Program Name: _____

Date of Evaluation: _____

Evaluator(s): _____

This checklist aims to ensure all critical components of an Outcome-Based Training (OBT) short term curriculum are well-defined, aligned, and effectively implemented.

Section	Category/Criteria Detail	Yes	No	Partially	Comments/Evidence
1. Foundation and Program Level Outcomes					
1.1	Vision, Mission, and input document				
1.1.1	Was a comprehensive value chain Analysis conducted (industry, societal, professional bodies, alumni, Trainees), and adequacy of input document (tracer study, market analysis, etc) for curriculum review /development?				
1.1.2	Are the findings of the value chain analysis and related input documents for curriculum revision/development clearly reflected in the program's rationale and objectives?				
1.2	Training Outcome (TO)				
1.2.1	Are TOs clearly defined, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART)?				
1.2.2	Do TOs align with relevant national/international standards or accreditation body requirements (if any)?				

1.2.3	Do TOs comprehensively cover the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes for the discipline?				
1.2.4	Is there a documented process for defining and reviewing TOs involving relevant stakeholders?				
2. Module Level Design and Alignment					
2.1	Module Learning Outcomes (MLOs)				
2.1.1	Are MLOs for each course clearly defined, specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART)?				
2.1.2	Do MLOs specify what Trainees are expected to know, understand, or be able to do upon completion of the course?				
2.1.3	Does the set of all MLOs collectively contribute to the achievement of all TOs?				(Check for gaps or overemphasis)
2.2	Curriculum Structure and Content				
2.2.1	Is the curriculum structure logical, and does it ensure a progressive development of knowledge and skills?				(e.g., prerequisite structure, sequencing of courses)
2.2.2	Does the Module content (topics, materials) directly support the achievement of the stated MLOs?				
2.2.3	Is there a balance between theoretical knowledge (30%) and practical application (70%) in the curriculum?				

Year of Excellence

2.2.4	Does the curriculum incorporate contemporary issues, ethical considerations, and relevant technologies?				
2.2.5	Are the credit hours and workload for each course appropriate for achieving the MLOs?				
3. Training, Learning, and Assessment Strategies					
3.1	Training and Learning Activities (TLAs)				
3.1.1	Are diverse TLAs proposed that are appropriate for achieving the MLOs and catering to different learning styles?				(e.g., lectures, labs, projects, PBL, internships)
3.1.2	Do TLAs promote active training, critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaborative skills?				
3.1.3	Is there a clear rationale for the choice of TLAs for each course, linked to the MLOs?				
3.2	Assessment Methods				
3.2.1	Are a variety of assessment methods (formative and summative) used to measure the attainment of MLOs?				(e.g., exams, quizzes, projects, presentations, portfolios)
3.2.2	Do assessment methods directly and effectively measure the achievement of the specific MLOs they target?				(Constructive Alignment)
3.2.3	Are assessment criteria and rubrics clearly defined and communicated to Trainees?				
3.2.4	Is there a plan in place to provide timely and constructive feedback to Trainees on their				

		performance?				
3.2.5		Is there a clear mapping of assessment tasks to MLOs for each course?				
	3.3	Assessment of TO				
3.3.1		Is there a comprehensive plan for assessing the attainment of each TO using direct and indirect measures?				
3.3.2		Are both Module level (aggregation of MLO attainment) and program-level assessments (capstone, exit surveys) used?				
3.3.3		Are performance indicators defined for each TO to facilitate their measurement?				
4. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI)						
	4.1	Is there a documented process for regularly collecting data on the attainment of MLOs and TO?				
	4.2	Are mechanisms in place to gather feedback from Trainees, faculty, alumni, employers, and other stakeholders?				(e.g., surveys, focus groups, advisory boards)
	4.3	Is there a defined process for analyzing assessment data and feedback to identify areas for curriculum improvement?				
	4.4	Are there clear procedures for making and documenting curriculum revisions based on the CQI findings?				
	4.5	Is there a schedule for periodic review and updating of the TO, and the overall				

	curriculum?				
4.6	Are faculty members involved in the CQI process and provided with necessary training and support?				
5. Resources and Support					
5.1	Are adequate and appropriate physical resources (classrooms, labs, equipment, library) available to support the OBT curriculum?				
5.2	Are sufficient qualified faculty members available with expertise in the subject areas and OBT methodologies?				
5.3	Is there provision for faculty development and training on OBT principles, curriculum design, and assessment?				
5.4	Are adequate IT resources and learning technologies available to support Training, learning, and assessment?				
5.5	Are Trainees support services (advising, counseling, career services) aligned with the OBT model?				
6. Documentation and Communication					
6.1	Is the curriculum documentation clear, consistent, and easily accessible to faculty, Trainees, and stakeholders?				
6.2	Are processes for curriculum approval and modification clearly defined and				

		documented?				
	6.3	Is information about the OBT approach and program outcomes effectively communicated to prospective and current Trainees?				