

Program Efficacy Report Spring 2013

Name of Department: Automotive

Efficacy Team: Todd Heibel and Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuation

Overall the program does a good job addressing and analyzing each area and providing specific examples, though certain items lack full development and supporting data. Sufficient evidence is provided to show the program is effective and planning appropriately. Most importantly, perhaps, is that the Automotive Technology Department does not assume that infrastructural updates will occur within the near future. Instead, it offers alternative and innovative plans for continued service to students and area employers.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	Meets
Part I: Access		
Demographics	<i>The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population</i>	<i>The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance. If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.</i>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>The very low enrollment of females, in relation to the general college population, in the Automotive program is discussed and the program provides examples of outreach, recruitment and partnership efforts to address the issue. The issue of diversity and recruitment of under-served populations is also discussed within other sections of the efficacy document.</p>		
Pattern of Service	<i>The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.</i>	<i>The program provides evidence that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs. If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The program provides specific information about scheduling of classes to give access to day and evening students. In addition, a spread of certificates, including an entry-level certificate, are offered to meet student needs. Though no online courses are offered, it is noted that the possibility was investigated and hybrid courses are being considered. Information about which courses or times were most in demand would be useful to demonstrate that patterns of service dovetail with student needs, but with cutbacks in sections, it may not be possible to distinguish such patterns.

Part II: Student Success

Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success

Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.

Program provides an analysis of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.

If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The rising retention and success rates are discussed, although specific data from the EMP one-sheet would strengthen this discussion. Despite cutbacks, the number of certificates awarded has doubled. It also notes the experimental learning community which paired an automotive course with a reading course was successful enough for the department to want to replicate that model with more courses. The WSCH numbers that are included in this section are irrelevant as that is a measure of productivity, not student success (although it suggests that the department is serving additional students with fewer faculty). The supplemental data was relevant and useful and included short explanations for context. Information about job placement for certificate earners might have been useful to include, if available. Although it is an ambitious endeavor, the Automotive Technology Department should consider exit surveys and longitudinal tracking of program graduates as a means to gather data about job placement and procurement.

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes

Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.

Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The description here shows that SLOs are up to date and being assessed on schedule and gives an example of an SLO assessment leading to a content change. Multiple examples of SLO use or change would have strengthened this section, as would a brief description of how individual course SLO assessments are (or will be) mapped to certificate-level SLO assessments.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness

Mission and Purpose

The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.

The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The program mission clearly aligns with the college mission; however, the explanation is a bit brief and circular.

Productivity	<i>The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.</i>	<i>The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.</i>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>Despite cuts, the FTES and WSCH for the program are good. An explanation of below-institutional-average efficiency is discussed within the <i>Student Success</i> section and should have been incorporated into this section. Nonetheless, an explanation is provided. The analysis also explains other measures of productivity such as qualifying for national certification, Perkins funds, working with local employers, etc. Plans for continued productivity include input from industry advisory committees and related community and industry needs (e.g. alternative-fuel and hybrid vehicle technologies).</p>		
Relevance, Currency, Articulation	<p><i>The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Out of date course(s) that are not launched into Curricunet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.</i></p>	<p><i>The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.</i></p>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>The program's content is up to date, and it provides explanation of error in the Content Review Summary (old version of newer active course). It appears that additional course curriculum is being written in order to replace defunct courses.</p>		
Part IV: Planning		
Trends	<i>The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.</i>	<i>The program <u>identifies and describes</u> major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.</i>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets</p> <p>Trends are well described and specific measures are mentioned to demonstrate planning. For example, continuation and expansion of learning cohorts that incorporate reading, writing, and science skills; expansion of alternative-fuel and hybrid technology training; increasing linkages with off-site partners; and introduction of newer "green" paint technologies are emphasized within this section. Most importantly, perhaps, is that the Automotive Technology Department has plans in place that include two scenarios: (a) an expansion of their current, on-campus facilities, and (b) lacking expansion of current, on-campus facilities, increasing partnerships with off-site facilities (as a means to accommodate additional students and ever-changing technologies).</p>		
Accomplishments	<i>The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.</i>
<p>Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does Not Meet</p> <p>A number of strengths are mentioned; however, how the program plans to capitalize on those strengths is unclear. This seems to be a weak point in a number of reports, so the committee suggests that the directions be revised.</p>		

Weaknesses/challenges	<i>The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>	<i>The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.</i>
------------------------------	--	--

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

Job and technology trends are covered as well as need for space and new equipment. The problem of being able to train for the new technology (hybrid, green tech) while continuing to offer current courses (still relevant and in demand) was noted and planning is underway to address that. Partnerships, the learning community, and outreach strategies are mentioned, demonstrating plans to meet these challenges. Once again, while the program demonstrates a need for facility updates and expansion, it clearly states that it will continue to serve student and community needs in the absence of on-campus infrastructural changes (through off-campus and other partnerships).

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate

	<i>Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i>	<i>Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i>
	<i>Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.</i>	<i>Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.</i>

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets

The response covers both technology and partnerships, giving specific examples of the program’s implementation of these strategic initiatives. In doing so, it implicitly incorporates the campus and community climate, as it endeavors to serve specific student and larger community employment needs.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories

<i>Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.</i>	<i>Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.</i>
--	---

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no “Does not Meets” in the previous efficacy review): Meets

The reviewers considered the program to meet this expectation by implication, as it could not locate the previous efficacy report and associated feedback from the Program Review Committee. The overall report addresses all areas, save for the *Accomplishments* section, very well. However, the previous “does not meets” should have been itemized and specific connections made pointing to how this document specifically addresses those deficits. [The instructions for this part might need to be revised in the future.]