PROGRAM REVIEW UPDATE 2015-2016

Program: Automotive Technology

Division: STEMPS Date: 10/6/15

Writer(s): Brian Hagopian, Terry Johnson, James Weston

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Brian Hagopian

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Purpose: To document significant program accomplishments, plans and needs between Triennial Program Reviews. This update should provide a snapshot of your program.

Time Frame: This update should reflect on program status during the 2014-15 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2016-17.

Topics: The first section of this Program Review Update focuses on general program reflection and planning. The second and third sections focus on reflection and planning regarding Student Learning Outcomes.

Scope: While this Program Review Update does ask for some analysis of data, detailed data reports in the form of appendices should be reserved for the Triennial Program Review.

Instructions:

- 1) Please fill in the following information as completely as possible.
- 2) If the requested information does not apply to your program, please write "No Changes Since the Program Planning Update."
- 3) Send an electronic copy of this form to the Program Review Committee Chair and your Dean by 10/12/15.

Part One: Program Snapshot

A. Have there been any significant changes to your program, your program's data or your program's needs since the previous Program Planning Update?

If there are any changes, describe the relevant information and its significance in the space below.

These changes might have originated from within the program or because of an external source (the institution or the state, for example). Possible sources of relevant information might include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Data generated by your program
- Data from the Office of Institutional Research
- CEMC Data
- Retirements
- State Mandates
- Labor Market Data

No Changes Since the Program Planning Update

B. What objectives, initiatives, or plans from the 2014 Program Planning Update (PPU) have been achieved and how?

Although not fully complete we are well on our way to achieving National Automotive Technicians Education Foundation (NATEF) accreditation, our main initiative at the 2014 PPU. CTE Coordinator Vicki Shipman was able to secure funds to increase and modernize our tool and equipment supplies to the level NATEF desires and hopefully pay for the accreditation site visit in 2016.

On the 2014 PPU we also had a plan to re-introduce our smog license classes in anticipation to an increase demand (according to our advisory board) for licensed smog technicians. Thankfully we have added the first class in our smog license series to the 2016 Spring schedule.

C. What obstacles has your program faced in achieving objectives, initiatives, or plans?

As is the case with many small programs on campus (or any campus) lack of personnel to carry out large time consuming initiatives/projects like NATEF accreditation. Just not enough hours in the day after the regular day to day work is done.

The continui	ng quest to achieve NATEF accreditation.
	isted under question (D) connect to this year's planning priorities (listed below)? If so
Plannii • • •	ng Priorities for 2015-16 Establish regular and ongoing processes to implement best practices to meet ACCJC standards Provide necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance Develop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment of SLOs into college processes Expand tutoring services to meet demand and support student success in Basic Skills, CTE and Transfer courses.
NATE and v 2. Deve of SL	de necessary institutional support for curriculum development and maintenance- To achieve EF accreditation we will need to further develop our curriculum to align with NATEF standards we will obviously need institutional support when doing so. Hop processes to facilitate ongoing meaningful assessment of SLOs and integrate assessment Os into college processes- Although the program has already fully integrated SLO's into all D classes NATEF requires the use of SLO's as well so we will need to continue to maintain our standards.
F. Instruction completion? This data ca f your progra	nal programs: Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful courseXXyesno n be found here: http://goo.gl/y9ZBmt) am did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this cogram planning or resource requests.

G. How have students been impacted by the work of your program since the last Program Planning Update (PPU)?

The job market is very hot right now for automotive technicians, dealerships and independent shops are desperate for qualified entry level talent. Despite this we have retained many (not all unfortunately) of our students who are engaged and excited about finishing our program. We believe much of this is due to the upcoming opportunities to graduate from a NATEF accredited school and the opportunity to leave LPC with a smog license which should command a better job and higher pay right out of school.

Part Two: SLO/SAO Assessment Review

Review your program's SLO assessment results for AY 2014-2015 and respond to the following questions.

A. 	Discuss how assessment results in at least one course in the program indicate success in student learning (OR) Discuss how assessment results of at least one SAO in the program indicate success in service to students.	_
В.	Discuss assessment results that indicate a need for improvement.	
C .	Instructional Programs: For the course(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program, or someone in your program, made changes or plans to make changes in pedagogy as a result SLO assessment results. Non-Instructional Programs: For the areas(s) listed in (B) above, discuss how your program made changes or plans to make changes as a result of SAO assessment results.	t of
D.	Instructional Programs Only: Give an example of a change in the number of units and/or lab hours based on assessment data, if applicable.	ı
E.	Instructional Programs: Discuss how distance education course assessment results compa face-to-face courses, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program has distance	re to
	education courses.) Non-Instructional Programs: Discuss how SAO assessment results for online services complete face-to-face services, if applicable. (Respond to this question if your program provides services online.)	pare
١	We do not offer DE classes.	

F.	Did your program discover the not the assessment results?	eed for additional re	esources (for AY 15-16 o	or 2016-17) based on
	If yes, please explain.			

Part Three: SLO/SAO Continuous Improvement Process

A. SLO Planning through AY 2016-17

As appropriate for your program, please address each of the following areas. For each area, describe your program's plans starting now and continuing through the academic year 2016-17. Focus on how the program's SLO process will impact student learning or the student experience at Las Positas College.

1. SLO/SAO assessments: How does your program plan to use assessment results for the continuous improvement of student learning or services? (NOTE: 100% of courses in your disciplines should be assessed a minimum of once every two years. Each program must assess at least 25% of its courses every semester. Programs with SAOs should assess at least 50% of their SAOs every year).

Examples might include (Your responses may vary.):

- changing number of units/lab hours
- changing pedagogy/curriculum
- changing assessments
- changing service hours
- changing modes of service delivery

2. Ha	ave your assessment results shown a need for ne	w/revised SLO/SAOs?	YES □	NO □
	If yes, complete the table below:			
	Estimated number of courses for which			
	SLOs will be written or revised:			
	Estimated number of SAOs that will be written or revised:			
	a. What courses or SAOs will your program	assess during this acade	emic year (2015-16)?

b. Instructional programs only: In order to budget to pay part-time faculty to work on SLOs during the academic year 2015-16, estimate the number of part-time faculty in your program who are likely to participate in the SLO process in 2015-16.

Number of Part-Time faculty who will participate in the SLO process (creating, assessing or discussing SLOs)

Fall 2015	
Spring 2016	