



Program Review Report

Programs: AA and BA in Early Childhood Education; AA and BA in Elementary Education; and Certificates in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education

College: Department of Teacher Education

Review Date: February 2, 2023

All Teacher Education programs (including the associate and bachelor degrees in Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education as well as certificates in Elementary Education, Secondary Education, and Special Education) underwent a CAEP review and visit in the fall semester 2023. The narrative, minus direct evidence, was provided to the 2024 Program Review Committee that same semester. Because CAEP does not cover all aspects of internal program review, Dr. Sandra Rodriguez also completed an abbreviated version affiliated with internal self-study requirements for consideration by the 2024 Program Review Committee.

First and foremost, the department must meet all areas for improvement as identified in the upcoming April 2024 CAEP report. In addition, some recommendations came from internal peer reviewers using a rubric to rate the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Beginning on page 2 is a list of criterion reviewers scored on the abbreviated Program Review Rubric. Please pay as either in "early development" or "fails to meet" criteria. In some cases, a recommendation and/or expectation for improvement is articulated by peer reviewers. For your upcoming program report, pay special attention to comments pertaining to Criterion 2, clarity on advisement mentioned in Criterion 3, the discrepancy on retention in Criterion 4.2, and External Advisory Committee information in Criterion 7.

Your next program report and check in will be scheduled in May 2024. At this time, the program will need to update the Provost on the official report from CAEP and highlight progress made on the recommended action items that begin on page 2. Use the Interim Report Template to report your progress for the upcoming review. The aforementioned template and an example information type/detail expected is available under the Job Aids link at the bottom of the Academic Program Review website (<https://nnmc.edu/home/academics/office-of-the-provost/academic-program-review/>).

Larry Guerrero, Interim Provost
Vice President for Academic Affairs
AVP for Student Success

Criterion 1: Mission & Introduction

1. Provide an overview of the program and the context of where it is housed within the institution (what department, etc.). Describe the hierarchical structure of the department in which the program is housed.
2. Align your program mission and vision with NNMC's mission and vision. What changes has the program made to the mission statement since inception, the last review, or in the last 5-7 years? Why were these changes made? Are any revisions planned?
3. Describe the national, regional, state and local outlook for this occupation or related field. What are the current and projected job openings per year (use Gray Associates Software to develop the narrative)?

Rubric Category	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Early Development (1)	Fails to Meet Criteria (0)
1.1	The overview thoroughly (includes succinct description that explains what program is designed to teach, how it supports student success and its goals) articulates how it fits into the larger department in which it is housed.	The overview adequately describes how it fits into the larger department in which it is housed.	The overview discusses how the program fits into the larger department in which it is housed but fails to make clear connections. It discusses plans to develop or improve the program.	Administrative oversight of the program within the department is not apparent within the review.
1.2	The review has a clearly defined mission that is fully aligned with departmental and College missions. Elements of the College's strategic plan are clearly integrated into the program. If applicable, the review clearly articulates changes made to the mission in the last 5-7 years and describes how the program will anticipate and make future changes based upon College and departmental influence. If less than 5 years, explain why. There is a clear strategy for responding to industry needs and the strategic direction of the College.	The review has a clearly defined mission that is aligned with departmental and College missions. The review articulates changes made to the mission that are over 7 years old and describes how the program will anticipate and make future changes. If less than 5 years explain why.	The review has a mission that is partially aligned with the departmental and/or College mission(s). The review either articulates program changes made to the mission OR anticipates future changes.	The review has no defined mission or a mission that is vaguely articulated or not aligned with departmental or College missions. Administrative oversight of the program mission is not apparent.

1.3	The review provides GA current and projected job openings per year. Job placement and salary data demonstrates sustained employment and ability to earn the regional living wage for completers.	The review provides GA current and projected job openings per year. Job placement and salary data suggests future, if not immediate, sustained employment for completers.	The review loosely aligns the program with GA current and projected openings per year. Salary for graduates is not markedly higher than those directly beginning employment.	The review fails to align the program with GA current and projected openings per year.
------------	--	---	--	--

Reviewer Comments:

1.1: An organizational chart/narrative is provided.

1.2: Conceptual framework - culturally relevant, aligned with higher education concepts; and outer ring which aligns with NNMC 's mission/vision, as: "Celebrating the uniqueness of northern New Mexico's multicultural, multilingual students and communities," representing the joy of working in a region that celebrates long-held traditions that espouse the building of community as the foundation for hope and success for all students.

Criterion 2: Student Learning Outcomes Assessment & Curriculum

Note: This criterion should have been addressed in the external accreditation self-study.

Internal peer reviewers commented: There is no assessment plan mentioned in the CAEP Report. An assessment plan and results are necessary.

Criterion 3: Faculty Qualifications, Effort, & Evaluation

Note: This criterion should have been addressed in the external accreditation self-study.

Internal peer reviewers commented: Table 4 indicates the qualifications of full-time faculty and their roles, but I could not find information about adjunct faculty and their qualifications. The self-study includes many examples of valuable departmental committee work that shows a commitment to excellence in the program. However, it was difficult to find details on faculty teaching load and faculty to student ratio. The narrative analysis in Standard R.1 demonstrates how faculty are supported in teaching effectiveness and how they are evaluated. Additionally, standards for teacher certification are maintained for faculty as they are for students in the teaching pathway. Faculty have P-12 certificates or licenses. There is ample evidence of faculty professional development and affiliation with Elevate NM. It is unclear if this is the equivalent of membership in a professional organization. Completion of Table 3.4 may provide more concise information on faculty membership in professional organizations. Standard R3 indicates commitment to enrollment and impressive growth of the program. Recruitment efforts have brought enrolment to a stable pre pandemic level. R3.2 Indicates the commitment to advising. R3.3 provides additional information about expectations of advisors and how advisors support student success. It could be clearer how advisement sessions are documented and how the advising load is distributed.

Criterion 4: Student Success

1. What are the enrollment trends gauged with Student Credit Hours (SCH) within this program over the course of the review cycle? Write an analysis of what these data indicate about your program. Be sure to include factors that may impact student enrollment. Utilize a section of the NNMC Program Review Table here.
2. Discuss the retention rates from Fall to Spring and Fall to Fall. Has student retention remained in an acceptable range over the course of the review cycle? Does modality factor into retention rates? Utilize a section of the NNMC Program Review Table here.
3. Assess completion/graduation numbers for the program. Are numbers increasing or decreasing? Explain why. What are the median years to graduate? Is the increase or decrease in line with program goals? Utilize a section of the NNMC Program Review Table here.
4. If applicable, discuss pass rate data for any licensure/certification test required of your students for the last 3 years. Utilize a section of the NNMC Program Review Table here.
5. Highlight the accomplishments and external honors (such as special experiences/projects, honors, publications, presentations, internships, etc.) received by students in the program over the course of this cycle.
6. What were some positive and negative feedback received from students as they complete their degrees? Highlight any trends or insights that came from exit surveys over the course of the cycle.

Rubric Category	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Early Development (1)	Fails to Meet Criteria (0)
4.1	The review indicates the program tracks its student credit hour trends and highlights excellent enrollment trends (5% growth or an average of over 51 SCH) over a consistent period of time.	The review highlights stable enrollment trends (1-5% growth or an average of 51 SCH at minimum) over the period of time.	The review indicates decreasing enrollment trends (0% growth or below an average 51 SCH).	The review indicates minimal to no enrollment (0% growth and below an average 51 SCH).
4.2	The retention rate Fall to Fall is consistently over 85%. The review indicates the program is tracking learning, retention, and performance in all modalities and is capitalizing on success and responding to any concerning data with action plans and follow up.	The retention rate Fall to Fall is consistently over 60%. The review indicates the program is tracking learning, retention, and performance in all modalities and is capitalizing on success and responding to any concerning data with action plans.	The retention rate Fall to Fall is between 30% and 60%. The review indicates the program is tracking learning, retention, and performance in all modalities.	The retention rate Fall to Fall is less than 30%. The review indicates the program is not able to track learning, retention, and performance in all modalities.

4.3	The review presents data that indicate program graduates are increasing by over 5%.	The review presents data that indicate program graduates are maintaining or increasing up to 5%.	The review presents data that indicate program graduates are decreasing within 5%.	The review presents data that indicate the program graduates are decreasing more than 5%.
4.4 N/A	Licensure pass rates fall within board expectations.	Licensure pass rates fall within board expectations.	Licensure pass rates are improving toward board expectations.	Licensure pass rates fail to fall within board expectations.
4.5	The review highlights accomplishments and honors for at least 25% of the program students in the last three years.	The review highlights accomplishments and honors for at least 5% of the program students in the last three years.	Accomplishments and honors are anecdotal.	Accomplishments and honors do not exist or are not documented.
4.6	Feedback is sufficient, periodic, and remarkably positive.	Feedback is periodic and positive.	Feedback is sporadic and a mix of positive and negative.	Feedback has not been collected or the feedback is mostly negative.

Reviewer Comments:

- 1. Enrollment trends:** The review that was submitted disaggregated in-person and online. One had a decline and one grew. It appears to me that if you can combine them, the program had a nearly 5 percent overall increase in SCH.
- 2. Retention:** Retention rates for the program appear to have declined by 11.7 percent but the review suggests that this is an error but it is unclear. The most recent retention rate was 39 percent.
- 3. Completion/graduation:** According to the review the 3 of graduates decreased by percent for 20 ECED and by 13 percent for Elementary Ed. The n's for both are small (16 and 14 respectively in Y3).
- 4. Licensure/certification:** There was data provided but I was not clear on exactly how it correlated to the criteria for this particular area. I imagine the actual number of students becoming certified teachers is important but I could not tell here.
- 5. Accomplishments and external honors:** According to the rubric this criterion is assessing **student honors** but the review provided appears to be a list of resources developed and provided by the program.
- 6. Feedback:** The feedback provided was very positive but was only four or five selected comments.

Criterion 5: Program Analysis

1. Based on all the data gathered in this review, conduct a SWOT (Strength, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) Analysis. Be sure to include the last time a SWOT Analysis was conducted.

Rubric Category	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Early Development (1)	Fails to Meet Criteria (0)
5.1	The review indicates the program uses an evidence-based approach to identify strengths and weaknesses and has collectively developed and implemented ongoing strategies for enhancing areas of strengths and addressing weaknesses.	The review indicates the program uses an evidence-based approach to identify strengths and weaknesses and has developed strategies for enhancing areas of strength and addressing weaknesses.	The review indicates the program identified strengths and weaknesses but supplies little evidence to support its conclusions or has not developed strategies for enhancing areas of strength and addressing weaknesses.	The review indicates the program has not identified strengths and weaknesses or supplies no evidence to support its conclusions or has not developed strategies for enhancing areas of strength and addressing weaknesses.

Reviewer Comments: Reviewers were unable to access the SWOT Analysis from the CAEP platform; and therefore are unable to provide comment.

Criterion 6: Program Economics

1. Describe how the program is being effective with its resources. Provide Program Economics from Gray Associates including the ratio between gross revenue and instructional cost as well as the Program Economics Waterfall as evidence. Provide the 3-year Program Marginal Contribution from Gray Associates software and gross revenue and instructional cost. (You can request this information from IR.).

2. Provide the program's budget for the last three years. Explain how the budget is allocated to the program in question. Based on the data in this section, please write a recommendation for budget changes justifying this recommendation with the data you provided. Write an analysis of what these data indicate about your program.

Rubric Category	Exemplary (3)	Acceptable (2)	Early Development (1)	Fails to Meet Criteria (0)
6.1	The program is a revenue generator that contributes to cover the deficit of other programs. The GA margin is in the black. The gross revenue to instructional cost is larger than 1.0. There are more than 17 FTE per full-time faculty member.	The program finances are healthy and breaks even. There is at least 17 FTE per full-time faculty member. The gross revenue to instructional cost is larger than 0.95.	The program runs with a deficit but the gross revenue to instructional cost is at least 0.8. The FTE is less than 17 per full-time faculty member.	The program runs with a huge deficit. Its instructional cost is way beyond the revenue generated (The gross revenue to instructional cost is less than 0.8). The FTE is less than 10 per full-time faculty member.

6.2	The budget is enough to cover all needs of the program and provides for additional opportunities (services and professional opportunities). If applicable, the budget is sustainable after grant funding expires.	The budget is enough to cover instructional costs for the number of students served. Professional development, supplies, or equipment are not allocated. If applicable, the budget is sustainable after grant funding expires.	The budget is low and relies on a high number of adjunct faculty. If applicable, the budget is not stable after grant funding expires.	The budget is not enough to sustain even the most indispensable instructional costs. If applicable, the budget is not stable after grant funding expires.
6.3	The review identifies program competitors and is responsive to student needs and demands. The review reflects all GA factors that are in the top 70th percentile.	The review identifies the program competitors but does not discuss student needs or demands. The review reflects 3 of 5 GA factors in the top 70th percentile.	The review indicates vague knowledge of competitors. The review reflects 2 of 5 GA factors in the top 70th percentile.	The review fails to identify competitors in the market/area. All GA factors are in the bottom 50th percentile.

Reviewer Comments:

6.1: Early Childhood Program, Gross Revenue to Instructional Cost Ratio 1.18; Elementary Program, Gross Revenue to Instructional Cost Ratio 1.25; Alternative Licensure Program, Gross Revenue to Instructional Cost Ratio 1.65.

6.2: According to the Program Review report, "the budget as allocated through the I&G process does not provide for the necessary staff required to run a successful Department of Teacher Education." The budget is currently being supplemented by additional grant funding.

Criterion 7: External Stakeholders

Note: This criterion should have been addressed in the external accreditation self-study.

Internal Reviewer Comments: As per the self-study report an advisory group of area and community partners was organized and met on Friday, March 31, 2023 (page 43). No other pertinent information was available with regard to selection of the members, the roles and responsibilities of the advisory council, meeting agenda or meeting minutes.