

**Northern New Mexico College
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT • PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK 2009-10**

Department Education

Program Alternative Licensure Program

Date 12/2010

	(6) Commendable	(4) Acceptable	(2) Developing	(0) Under-developed
Mission	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s), and is in explicit alignment with the departmental and College mission statements.</i>	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s), and aligns in general with the departmental and College mission statements.</i>	<i>The program mission defines the program's primary purpose(s) but alignment to the departmental and/or College mission is either unclear or unstated.</i>	<i>The program mission is non-existent, or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p>Score and comments (4/6). The mission statement is OK. It can be improved. What type of teacher will the Department prepare? (K-12, K-8, Secondary?) It can be improved.</p>				
Outcomes	<i>SLO's indicate knowledge, skills and dispositions; they align clearly to the program mission and mission of the College.</i>	<i>SLO's indicate two of three aspects of student learning; align clearly to program mission and College mission.</i>	<i>SLO's are stated but unclear regarding two or more aspects of student learning and/or connections to program and College missions.</i>	<i>SLO's are non-existent, not stated in an acceptable format, and/or do not align to program mission and/or College mission.</i>
<p>Score and comments (3/6). Student learning outcomes listed are important and OK. However, they are very general. If your program is K-12 education, you must include statements that specify what your students will know, be able to do, or be able to demonstrate to teach K-12 students. Some outcomes can be better articulated. Example: Outcome 13: "Teacher Candidates believe that all students can learn". This outcome may be very difficult to measure, since quantifying a "belief" may become totally subjective. An outcome must be observable, measurable, and able to be demonstrated.</p>				
Measures & achievement targets	<i>Measures promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning; they are related to appropriate SLO's and have clear achievement targets.</i>	<i>Measures promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning; they relate to some but not all of the SLO's.</i>	<i>Measures exist but their relationships to the SLO's is unclear; they are incomplete and vague in addressing the SLO's.</i>	<i>Measures are non-existent or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p>Score and comments (2/6). The measures described promise to provide direct evidence of student learning through a standardized test, portfolio with a range of artifacts, and several observational assessments. One or two indirect measures would help triangulate the direct evidence. Having the portfolio and candidate assessment of classroom teach link to all 14 outcomes makes for much busy work, however. There is a big opportunity to improve the design by connecting each measure to the most compelling outcomes, only. The targets are OK.</p>				
Findings	<i>Findings provide compelling student learning data that follow details spelled out in the description of measures.</i>	<i>Findings include references to some (but not all) measures, and indicate extent to which most but not all SLO's were met as well as need for further actions (as appropriate).</i>	<i>Findings are initiated but incomplete; the overall sense of progress attained is hard to ascertain.</i>	<i>Findings are non-existent or not stated in an acceptable format.</i>
<p>Score and comments (2/6). There are three alternative licensure tracks, right? Different tracks must have different assessment designs and processes. Opportunities for improvement include: 1) Measure 3 ("Teacher Candidate Assessment of Classroom Teaching") measures 14 outcomes. Thus, we would expect different items measuring different outcomes; 2) Outcomes are measured according to grades. However, a grade by itself does not represent direct evidence that an outcome was/was not achieved if the corresponding exam/assignment/etc is not rigorously analyzed. Grades don't show that specific, tacit concepts have been mastered; Grades don't explicitly prove that the desired learning has taken place; grades may not be objective; 3) From this, having an instrument which is able to measure 14 outcomes is quite complicated. We suggest to measure different outcomes with different instruments or in different ex-</p>				

	ams/quizzes/etc (find the appropriate opportunity to measure each of them). "Copy and paste" has been doing throughout the assessment report. This needs to be addressed prior to external evaluation by assessment experts.			
Action Plan tracking	<i>Steps are spelled out with persons responsible and budget amounts as needed for implementing program improvements in ways that related compellingly to assessment findings.</i>	<i>Steps are spelled out for implementing program improvements in ways that address some of the assessment findings.</i>	<i>Steps are spelled out for implementing program improvements in ways that address one or two of the assessment findings.</i>	<i>There are no action steps listed.</i>
	Score and comments (2/6). One action plan is described, to "define technology and identify strategies for implementation into the curriculum." Are there any earlier plans? What is their status? Is technology the only area for improving the ALP tracks?			
Overall comments				
2.6 overall. There are a number of opportunities for improvement, starting with the overall design of the program assessment. If there are three tracks, you ought to consider assessing each track on its own merits. The measures and targets can be improved, and the findings be described in greater detail. Finally, the action plan/improvements (there is only one presented) can be developed in greater breadth and depth.				