

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

Department Fine Arts

Program Music (Jazz) BMus

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>
<b>Score and comments (6/6).</b> The program mission aligns well with the College mission; it defines the program's primary purpose concisely.				
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>
<b>Score and comments (6/6).</b> The SLO's address knowledge, skills, and dispositions. The SLO's align with the program's 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>
<b>Score and comments (5/6).</b> The measures promise direct and indirect evidence of student learning, including the indirect measure of an exit survey and a freshman-year interview. A highlight of the assessment is the use of a jury-system to evaluate students' competence. Tools for some of the measures, and their targets, are incomplete.				
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>
<b>Score and comments (2/6).</b> Data for studio performances and tests are presented, following the format that most NNMC faculty are using (course/semester, # students, # met target, class average). Faculty might consider explaining why aren't posted: e.g., explain why data were not collected for the interview measure, and all the other measures that are not completed. For instance, students haven't gotten that far into the program for recitals to apply. Remember who the audience is: HLC assessment experts. Regarding the first measure and findings, it's not clear how studio performance measures knowledge of theory. Regarding the 7 <sup>th</sup> measure (Exit Survey): it should be made clearer in WEAVE that all outcomes are addressed; only outcome #1 is identified.				
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>
<b>Score and comments (4/6).</b> Steps as listed are spelled out clearly with persons responsible. Budget is addressed also, and no increases are foreseen. The "Revision performance rubric" ("details" in WEAVEonline) needs to be completed, as do the protocol for the interview measure, recitals rubric, and especially, the portfolio design. Targets need to be finalized for all of the program measures. Consider ways to get adjunct colleagues involved. <i>Continued below.</i>				

Overall comments

**4.6 overall.** Between "commendable" and "acceptable." We recommend finishing the assessment design (measures, targets, tools, and assignments), and adding several action plans toward this end, and also getting adjunct colleagues involved.