

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 28, 2011

To: Michael Saito, Lloyd Sanborn

From: College Effectiveness Review Committee (CERC)

Subject: 2009-2010 Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP) Program Review

The process of Program Review assures quality in all facets of our operation at Hawaii Community College. It encompasses planning, assessment, and evaluation. Thank you for conducting and submitting the annual and comprehensive program reviews for the ABRP Program. This is not an end into itself but a part of a process that leads to a much greater end. It answers the questions:

- Did our programs and services work to our expectations?
- Did we get the results we expected?
- How can we improve what we are doing?

The community college system initiated a set of formulas to ensure consistency in identifying the strength of programs. As such, the demand, efficiency, effectiveness, and overall health of a program reflect the results of the formulas.

Overall Health Call – Healthy

CERC commends the writers Lloyd Sanborn and Mike Saito for a thorough program review for Auto Body Repair and Painting (ABRP) that clearly describes program effectiveness, an action plan for program improvement, and budget priorities.

Demand: Healthy

This element is based on the number of majors to annual new/replacement positions. Number of majors increased from 30 to 41 with 11 new and replacement positions in the County. This equates to 3.7 majors per job, a Healthy call. The 41 majors would be the ABRP program's maximum capacity.

Efficiency: Healthy

This element is based on two criteria – class fill rate and student to faculty ratio. The number of majors to the two FTE BOR appointed faculty is 20.5, a Healthy call. The fill rate increased from 66% to 70% but is deemed Cautionary. Despite the increase in the number of majors and fill rate, the number of low-enrolled classes continues to be high at 11 classes. The reasons for these disparities were clearly explained in the narrative – state of economy, students not fully cognizant of the physical demands of industry.

Effectiveness: Healthy

This element is based on three criteria – unduplicated degrees and certificates earned in relationship to number of majors, unduplicated degrees and certificates earned in relationship to annual/new replacement positions, and persistence from fall to spring. The ratio of degrees awarded to majors of 24.4% is Healthy and the ratio of degrees awarded to new and replacement positions in the County of .91 is Healthy. The 75% Persistence (Fall to Spring) is an increase of 3% and is Healthy. 89% had successful completion, an increase from 73%.

Other elements:

- In addition to the 4 Associate of Applied Science and 6 Certificates of Achievement degrees awarded, there were 14 Other Certificates awarded, which would include the Certificate of Completions.
- In the area of Perkins Core Indicators, the Reviewers commend the program for its meeting three of six core indicators (Retention/Transfer, Nontraditional Participation, Nontraditional Completion); at the same time, the reviewers note that ABRP "fell short of goals in the other three areas" (Technical Skill Attainment, Completion, and Student Placement, pages 5-6).

ABRP's effort to meet student needs and support college goals was evident. The strength of the presentation, in particular the analysis of how the program addressed its goals targeted in the previous comprehensive review and what budget requests the program needed to achieve its goals in the future, convinced the Reviewers that the program's requests to acquire needed equipment, professional development, and improvements to facilities warrant serious consideration and should be assigned a high priority in budgetary planning.

In the future, the program should consider the use of specifics in its analysis. For instance:

- On page 3, the writers reported that a 2009 assessment of PLO 2 proved that this "critical learning outcome is being met at a level required in the industry." Inclusion of the number of students involved in the assessment would have aided the Reviewers in weighing the effectiveness of the assessment tool.
- On page 3 contains the claim that "Although the artifacts of the Spring 2010 Assessment have not yet been evaluated it is already evident that the results are greatly improved over previous attempts of assessing the same area." No details were reported to explain how improvement could be "evident" without the artifacts having been assessed.
- The same paragraph contained a confusing sentence — "In line with the assessment progression the current assessment plan for Fall 2010, although not part of this report, are glaringly apparent" — that may have been made clear by the insertion of "the goals of" after "progression."
- More importantly, "the quandaries" ABRP identified on page 4 (second paragraph) could be further analyzed by identifying specific numbers for "many" and "several" students, especially since these observations, along with "established precedents," were used to support the removal of course requirements for a Certificate of Achievement. An explanation of how these actions relate to an earlier claim (page 3) that "even though students may enter the program at low levels of academic preparation it is possible to raise the level of learning to the point required to succeed in this industry" and a later claim (page 5) that classes may be low enrolled because students "are stymied by the advanced

levels of knowledge required to succeed in today's automotive repair industry" might assist the CERC Reviewers in understanding the complex situation that ABRP faculty face while trying to meet academic, industry and student needs.

- On page 7, the writers reported "A survey of program graduates that could be accounted for reveals that 39% found employment in auto body related businesses, 52% continued on to other programs of study at the college, and 9% were employed in jobs outside of the automotive field." Without knowing how many students responded or "could be accounted for," CERC evaluators were unable to judge the importance of the survey results.

Considering the inclusion of low-enrolled classes as a weakness in the section on Program Health Indicators, in the future, the reviewers would like to see a more detailed explanation of how the ABRP will face its "Conundrum of serving all comers, many at low levels and having poor learning skills while teaching highly technical and intensive hand skills vocation" (page 6). If "Establishing entry level requirements may raise student qualities, but be a barrier to admission and have negative student count numbers," how exactly does ABRP intend to meet this challenge?

You have committed the ABRP program to an ambitious set of goals. Set specific benchmarks and concrete goals so you can monitor the program's progress throughout the year.

To be effective, student learning outcomes assessment must contribute directly to student learning. Moreover, assessment for improvement is most effective when it is embedded within the curriculum and so has a direct connection to student learning. You have done a commendable job on assessing student learning outcomes as well as closing the loop by reflecting on assessment results and making adjustments to your teaching and/or curriculum. It is through the process of ongoing assessment of student learning outcomes that you can improve the quality of your program and demonstrate the level of quality to others.

By 2012, ACCJC is requiring that all programs reach the sustainable continuous quality improvement level for Program Review and Planning, and the proficiency level for Student Learning Outcomes. Including in the analysis of your program the results from assessing program learning outcomes is a step towards reaching these levels. Work with your division chair, dean, and/or assessment coordinator to develop a timeline to ensure that your program will be at those levels by 2012.

These recommendations are intended as suggestions for improvement to be considered in the next program review. As stated earlier, the CERC Reviewers commend ABRP for presenting a strong review that explains the needs of the department and justifies its budgetary requests. In light of the program's complex challenges, the Reviewers believe the College should seriously consider Auto Body Repair and Painting's budgetary requests and assign them a high priority in budget.

If you have any questions, please contact me at x47484 or jonishi@hawaii.edu.

c Clyde Kojiro
Jim Yoshida
Noreen Yamane