

**Career Education Program Two-Year Review  
Program Efficacy Report - Spring 2015**

**Name of Department:** Auto Collision

**Efficacy Team:** Christie Gabriel-Millette, Todd Heibel

**Overall Recommendation (include rationale):** **MEETS**

This report contains sufficient evidence to show program effectiveness. For example, the tremendous enrollment growth, increased success and graduation rates are well-documented. In addition, it's clear that curriculum has been updated to accommodate current industry needs. However, placement of this evidence should be in the designated sections. Data should be clearly tied to program descriptions and organized in a manner that supports each section appropriately.

**1. Purpose of this Program: MEETS**

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: The program description and mission seem to overlap but do clearly describe the program's purpose. Program demographics are clearly shown. Be sure to support data claims with visible data. E.G. "The Collision department has a diverse target population as listed below, and is also leader in the female student population with 12.8%" has no comparison data to validate its claim.

**2. Demand for this Program: MEETS**

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Labor Market data provides evidence of demand in this field. Local, metropolitan demand needs would enhance this argument. Performance measures listed in this section should be moved to section 3.

**3. Quality of this Program: MEETS**

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Faculty qualifications, partnerships, and performance data tables provide evidence of a quality program; however, much of the performance data descriptions (narrative) were left back in section 2. The Core 1 – performance goal is clearly stated; however, the other data are unclear when looking at the Perkins IV Core Indicators of Performance. The word Retention was used in place of Persistence (Core 3), but these are not the same measure, so be sure to accurately describe the data. (The Office of Research, Planning and Institutional Effectiveness can assist you with any data needs.) Additionally, Cores 2, 3, and 4 also surpass the state average and performance goals but are not mentioned in the report. This would have provided additional evidence of program quality. The creation of a table that combines these measures, rather than a narrative explanation, would add clarity to this section.  
[https://misweb.cccco.edu/perkins/Core\\_Indicator\\_Reports/Summ\\_coreIndi\\_TOPCode.aspx](https://misweb.cccco.edu/perkins/Core_Indicator_Reports/Summ_coreIndi_TOPCode.aspx)

**4. External Issues: DOES NOT MEET**

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: The program has been able to stay afloat with its Perkins funding, but no other external issues have been discussed in this section. The CTE Perkins Reports that were referred to are no longer included, so a summary of that data should be included if referring to it. Changes in the state and federal mandates, such as AB32, suggest a need to include information about green technology within the industry.

**5. Cost of this Program: DOES NOT MEET**

Creation of a table with a row showing Financial 2000's budget information and a row with Perkins information would show program expenditures vs. revenue. Also, a brief explanation of the data would add clarity.

**6. Two-Year Plan: DOES NOT MEET**

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Future changes for fall 2015 are stated; however, a two-year projection is not discussed. It is also stated that the program is underfunded, but this is not broken down. The addition of tables would show expenditures and need over the next two years. It would be helpful to refer back to the FTEF and need for more faculty, as well as equipment to stay current in the industry. The lack of funding should be mentioned in section 5, and mention of the growth of the transportation industry in the Inland Empire should be moved to section 4.