

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

Department Gen Ed

Program Area II Mathematics

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 (5/6). The Area II mission appears to align to the College statement on the Gen Ed program. Area II faculty might consider developing their own mission for Area II. It would need to align to the College's mission for Gen Ed as well as the mission for the entire institution. The more explicit the connections, the better.</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 (6/6). The outcomes listed come directly from the competencies of the state's common core. They are fine.</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 (6/6). While only two in number, the measures listed do provide direct and indirect evidence of student learning. They connect to the program outcomes in logical and appropriate ways. In addition, the departmental exams provide some measure of continuity across sections and different instructors. Area II faculty are to be commended for pulling this off. The targets are explicit and appropriate.</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 opportunities to improve the depth and breadth of Area II data presented in WEAVE. Only percentages of students meeting targets set for exams are offered. Minimally, faculty need to describe semester/course, number of students, subtotal who met targets, and class averages. Data gathering should improve in 2010-11 with the faculty's use of surveymonkey survey/data gathering tools. This work is exemplary and leading the way for others in our institution.</p>				
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>
<p>Score and comments (4/6). Improvement steps listed flow from the data provided, as limited as they are. They do need to be updated, and their statuses changed to reflect progress in implementing the plans. No completion dates are provided.</p>				

Continued below

Overall comments

4.6 overall. Between "commendable" and "acceptable." Definitely moving in the right direction. Immediate suggestions are to update the Action Plans/Improvements, and to ensure that data for 2010-11 will be detailed according to the specific suggestions provided above. This latter recommendation will likely be in place if and when the use of the faculty's SurveyMonkey data gathering tool is fully operational.