

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

Department Engineering

Program Mechanical

Date 12/06/10

	(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>
Score and comments (4/6): More alignment towards College mission in terms of service to and inclusion of the local population.				
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>
Score and comments (6/6): Commendable. Fits well with ABET accreditation and College mission.				
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>
Score and comments (3/6): There are many direct measures, which appear to be thorough, appropriate, and properly linked to the program outcomes. Consideration could be given toward developing several indirect measures, e.g., exit and graduate surveys, or focus group interviews. As for the targets, they are not stated clearly, are not consistent from one measure to another. There's a big opportunity to improve them throughout the assessment plan.				
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>
Score and comments (2/6): There is no discussion or analysis of results. Findings are not linked to outcomes; example: according to the assessment report, exams are used to measure outcomes 1, 5, and 6. However, there is no evidence that the exams contain problems or exercises related to those outcomes. There is no objective discussion regarding the performance on these skills. Provide specific exam items that demonstrate outcomes. E.g., for ECE 203 (exam measure), it says: "The test results showed the ability of students of analyzing electrical circuits. The relative poor score showed that students are lack of problem-solving skills. It also reflected the fact that students are lack of physics knowledge, since some of the students even not took engineering physics II course." The above				

	"assessment" does not help in identifying problems regarding the outcomes 1, 5, and 6, but represents a fuzzy, subjective evaluation. Thus, no precise action plan can be derived from it.			
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): Some action plans are fuzzy and not clear. Example: a good direction is addressed to encourage students to work in group. However, the report does not provide any hint on how to do this. Similar with other action plans (revise projects and rubric, office hours, etc.)			
Overall comments				
3.4 overall. Between developing and acceptable. The mission and outcomes are good, but targets, findings particularly, and improvement need more work. The faculty should strive for 4's at least in all of the areas assessed in this rubric.				