

Program being evaluated: *ABRP*

Date: *3/8/11* CERC Name: *Comprehensive Summary*

**COLLEGE EFFECTIVENESS REVIEW COMMITTEE (CERC)
Evaluation Tool for Comprehensive Program Reviews**

Purpose: This tool is used to evaluate Comprehensive Program Reviews for the AY 2010-11. Each CERC member will be completing one of these for each of the program reviews.

Part A. Program Effectiveness

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
<p>1. The narrative describes the program and how it supports the College's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO).</p> <p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Good narrative describing program and connection to mission and ILOs. Easy to read and understand; alignment with College is clear. Could be shorter and still effective. Good explanation of ABRP's connection to both the Colelge mission and ILOs. Well written, clearly describing the program and how is supports mission and ILOs</i></p>	<p>Not present or no connection to mission and ILO.</p>	<p>Adequate description and connection to mission and ILO.</p>	<p>Very thorough and strong connection to mission and ILO.</p>	<p>2.632</p>
<p>2. Summary of changes was made and explained.</p> <p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Technology was improved through the purchase of machines and equipment, a lecturer with expertise was hired, a computerized estimating system wwas acquired, is working with other campuses to standardize courses which will enhance curriculum lay the foundation for system wide articulation, the new spray booth is being used, and two CCs were added to improve completion of key components of the program. Thorough analysis of changes and data. Completion of 3/7 PLO assessments using industry standards are excellent; addition of 10GMAW is also benefit to students. Good collaboration w/4 campuses for curriculum based on Inter-Industry Conf. on Auto Collision Repair LIVE curriculum. New spray booth being used in Oct. 2009, 3 years after completion deadline. Two new certificates of completion. Very thorough summary based on assessment of PLOs and program review data.</i></p>	<p>Not present or weak explanation, and/or changes unsupported by evidence.</p>	<p>Adequate explanation and substantiated.</p>	<p>Very thorough and well substantiated.</p>	<p>2.632</p>

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
<p>3. Program strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>Not present or weak analysis.</p>	<p>Adequate analysis and perceptions.</p>	<p>Very thorough and substantial analysis and perception.</p>	<p>2.421</p>
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Program is healthy in all three areas; good discussion of Core Indicator data and PLOs. Clearly identified based on previous discussion of data analysis. Program health indicators are Healthy for all 3. Perkins Indicators met for 3/6 of the areas: underpreparedness and degree completion are problem areas. PLO assessment is beneficial to program because based on industry standards. Strengths are clearly identified as hands on training, diversity of learners, faculty w/strong industry connections. Excellent summary of weaknesses: obsolete technology, profess. development, student success through program.</i></p>				
<p>4. Progress on program goals since last comprehensive program review.</p>	<p>Not present or no progress.</p>	<p>Adequate progress.</p>	<p>Substantial progress.</p>	<p>2.395</p>
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>It is obvious that the lack of updated or current equipment is detrimental to the effectiveness of this program. I commend them for doing what they can with obsolete equipment. Figures were very helpful in the analysis of goal attainment. Progress on all goals, hindered by factors beyond program control, such as economic downturn. Progress was attempted and achieved. Excellent summarization of progress made on last PR's goals.</i></p>				
<p>5. Program's top three goals are based on evidence.</p>	<p>Not present or unsupported by evidence.</p>	<p>Adequate and supported by evidence.</p>	<p>Well substantiated by evidence.</p>	<p>2.632</p>
<p>Recommendations/Comments: <i>Acquire new equipment and technology, professional development opportunities for program faculty, and improvement to facilities. Irrefutable based on evidence and discussion presented. based on industry standards and state of the art technology; professional development to maintain faculty currency in the field; repair and maintenance to facilities.</i></p>				

Criteria	1 - Does Not Meet	2 - Meets	3 - Exceeds	Score
Part A. TOTAL				
Part A. AVG (TOTAL divided by 5)				12.711
Part A. AVG (TOTAL divided by 5)				2.683

Part B. Action Plan for Program Improvement

Summary Evaluation of Action Plan. (Reference: Table 1)

Reference Table 1	Does not meet = 1	Meets = 2	Score
Recommendations/Comments:	Incomplete table or unclear.	Complete table.	2

Part C. Action Plan Supports Budget Priority

Cost Item (Table 2)	Priority Ranking		Part C	Part A	Part B	Total
	1 = Low	2 = Medium	Score	Pg 2	Pg 2	C+A+B
1. <i>Body & frame alignment</i>	Action plan does not support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action plan partially supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	2.667	2.683	2	7.350
Comments: <i>Directly addresses student feedback. Will allow students to stay abreast with industry. This could be expensive but without current equipment the college cannot produce students who are on job ready. meets broad Goal C. Need to add this to Strategic Plan as a performance measure.</i>						
2. <i>Power shear</i>	Action plan does not	Action plan partially	2.667	2.683	2	7.350

	support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	completely supports budget request and fits specific Strategic Outcomes Goals.			
<p>Comments: <i>Frequent breakdowns and make-do repairs impede classroom function. Sounds important and affordable. Current equipment is obsolete. Important for artifact projects in LOA (assessment).</i></p>						
3. Spray painting equipment	Action plan does not support budget request nor does it support Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action plan partially supports budget request and supports some Strategic Outcomes Goals.	Action Plan completely supports budget request and fits specific Strategic Outcomes Goals.	2.722	2.683	2 7.406
<p>Comments: <i>Perhaps all equipment should be one goal so funds can be requested for professional development to address goal 2 and action strategy 3. EPA Mandate. EPA requirements should be met. New EPA mandates. New EPA requirement means this is a must. Health and Safety standard that should be mandatory. Health and safety issue.</i></p>						