Component	Quality			
	Developed	Developing	Underdeveloped	Not available
1. Program level learning outcomes (PLOs)	PLOs are current and clearly articulated on the NYIT Planning & Assessment website. PLOs sufficiently communicate program-level knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students will be able to demonstrate upon completion of the program, and are manageable in size (typically 5-7). PLOs are measurable (i.e., use action verbs that focus on observable student behavior). Program accreditation language may require putting PLOs in measurable terms via measurement instruments. PLOs align with the curriculum and are directly related to desired outcomes, i.e., job readiness, readiness	PLOs are available on the NYIT Planning & Assessment website but not current. There are too many PLOs to manageably assess them in a given assessment cycle. PLOs are general or vague (e.g., students will acquire skills to become independent learners). However, the measurement tools help clarify the intended PLOs. The PLOs are in passive terms or measurable, but still communicate observable student behavior (e.g., students will understand the output of impaired speech production through analysis of output). PLOs need some updating to be consistent with disciplinary standards.	Current PLOs are available, but not posted on the NYIT Planning & Assessment website. Neither the stated PLOs nor the associated measurement tools clearly communicate what learning students are expected to demonstrate upon graduation. PLOs read as course objectives rather than program level outcomes (e.g., recode existing variables in a dataset). PLOs are not measurable (i.e., do not focus on observable student behavior). PLOs indicate a level of learning that is not appropriate to the degree level. PLOs are not consistent with disciplinary standards.	PLOs are not available.

	for advanced study, professional standards. PLOs are reviewed by the program faculty regularly to ensure that they remain current and consistent with disciplinary standards.			
2. Methods & Tools	Authenticity is evident, i.e., methods are directly assessing student artifacts or performances. Appropriate mix of direct and indirect methods are present in a given assessment cycle. All measurement tools (e.g., test items, rubrics, scoring guides) should have clearly defined learning criteria for a given PLO. Measurement tools (e.g., rubrics, scoring guides, supervisor evaluation forms) have been reviewed for interrater reliability across evaluators. PLOs are assessed in multiple places (e.g., courses, clinical	A better mix of direct and indirect methods is needed for PLO assessment. Measurement tools have holistic learning criteria for a given PLO (e.g., an overall description for the PLO, but not descriptions per learning criteria for the PLO) – hindering identification of strengths and weaknesses for a given PLO. Measurement tools show some alignment to the PLO. Preliminary efforts to ensure interrater reliability have been initiated. There are some efforts to use assessment in multiple places in the curriculum or	No direct assessment methods were used for PLO assessment. Measurement tools do not provide data on how well students are achieving the PLO. Measurement tools are not aligned to the PLO. There have been no efforts to ensure interrater reliability. There are no efforts to use assessment in multiple places in the curriculum or reassessment during a given assessment cycle to evaluate where improvements are needed or if improvements are effective.	No measurement tools submitted for PLO assessment.

	placements, co-curricular opportunities) during a given assessment cycle when evaluating weak end-of-program performances or reassessment is used after interventions to evaluate improvements. The assessment represents a sufficient proportion of students in the program. When sampling is used, the sample size should represent at least 10% of students in the program, unless the program has 20 or fewer students, in which case all students should be included.	reassessment during a given assessment cycle to evaluate where improvements are needed or if improvements are effective. Proportion of students assessed relative to students in the program needs improvement.	Proportion of students assessed relative to students in the program is not reported.	
3. Assessment results and criteria based data analysis	Reported quantitative and/or qualitative data provides sufficient evidence of the degree to which students are achieving the PLO. Data is reported per learning criteria (e.g., sub-scores on certification exams, sub-scores of rubric items are analyzed and reported).	Reported data lacks sufficient evidence of the degree to which students are achieving the PLO. Analysis is based on holistic learning criteria for a given PLO, but does not allow for identification of strengths and weaknesses for a given PLO.	No data analysis addressing the degree to which students are achieving the PLO. The learning criteria for the PLO is not clear. Performance target is not identified for the PLO.	Either no assessment results, or no analysis of reported results.

	Analysis addresses relative strengths and weaknesses across learning criteria for a given PLO. Performance target for each PLO is identified and defensible. Analysis of performance in relation to target is provided. Interpretation of assessment results is at the program level (e.g., if PLO is assessed in two courses, results for the two courses are discussed for program level achievement, not course level achievement), offering a possible explanation for reported performance levels.	Performance target is identified, but the report does not offer analysis of performance in relation to the target. Interpretation of assessment results are at the course, rather than program level, but do offer possible explanations for performance levels.	Interpretation of results does not offer possible explanations of performance levels.	
4. Use of assessment results to make improvements in program learning outcome performance	Reported description of faculty review of assessment results. Reported both proposed *and actual* implementation of changes to improve program learning outcome performance.	Reported description of faculty review of assessment results. Reported proposed, but not *actual* implementation of changes to improve program learning outcome performance.	Assessment results were not shared and discussed with faculty members. No proposed or implemented changes to improve program learning outcome performance were reported.	Neither the review of assessment results nor changes to improve outcome performance were reported.

5.Effectiveness of improvement plan post-implementation	After the improvement plan is implemented, its effectiveness is re-assessed. Evidence of improvement in student learning is provided. If the improvement plan is not effective, an alternative plan for improvement is provided.	After the improvement plan is implemented, its effectiveness is re-assessed. Evidence regarding the effectiveness of the improvement plan on student learning is addressed.	The improvement plan is not implemented.	The effectiveness of the improvement plan is not addressed.
6. Involvement of all program faculty	Report indicates that most program faculty are involved in assessing PLOs, and use of PLO data for program improvement. Report indicates the degree to which it report reflects the views of the full program faculty.	Report indicates that most program faculty are involved in assessing PLOs, but fewer are actively involved in using PLO data for program improvement. Report reflects little input from program faculty and appears to have been authored by one or two faculty members.	Report suggests that a limited number of program faculty are involved in the assessment of PLOs. Report suggests that most program faculty are unaware of program assessment activities.	Report suggests that faculty are not involved in the assessment of PLOs, rather that data come from external agencies (e.g., licensing boards) or departmental staff.