
**Executive Summary**

Our review of all Auto Body Collision, Repair and Refinishing Programs began with a review meeting on April 26, 2013. During this meeting members reviewed various documents including: Program Mapping, Student Learning Outcome Course Evaluation Summary Forms, Outcome Assessment Reports, Advisory Minutes and EMSI Data. The written responses were then circulated amongst members for additional comments, questions, additions and edits in arriving at the final “reflection” found in this document.

PROGRAM MAP



CLO to PLO MATRIX:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | PLOs: *Upon satisfactory completion of the course requirements for the Auto body Refinishing Skills Recognitions Award the student will be able to:* | | |
| COURSE ID | CLO#: Students successfully completing this course will be able to: | Comply with current industry safety and environmental regulations. | Perform basic refinishing techniques in accordance with industry standards. | |
| AUBDY 301 | 1. Demonstrate the ability to comply with Industry safety and environmental concerns. | I,D |  | |
| AUBDY 301 | 2. Diagnose and perform minor repairs on non-structural automotive steel panels. |  | I | |
| AUBDY 321 | 1. List and explain the steps involved in the application of paint to a vehicle and demonstrate these techniques on a vehicle fender. | I, D | I | |
| AUBDY 322 | 1.  Write an estimate on a full vehicle project that will lead to a complete paint job. | D | D | |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ***I = Introduction*** | |  |  |  |
| ***D = Development*** | |  |  |  |
| ***M = Mastery*** | |  |  |  |

ANALYSIS

Our data analysis of the SRA: Auto Body Refinishing Program found that students in the program are generally very successful in demonstrating that they understand the safety and environmental regulatory aspects goals of the program. Professor Beebe uses an I-CAR industry standard Safety and Pollution Prevention exam to evaluate this knowledge of students when the move through AUBDY 301 and AUBDY 321. Performance for the sample of courses evaluated show 100% of the students that took the exam passed this assessment. Similarly, Professor Beebe uses the ASE industry Paint and Refinishing (B2) prep exam to evaluate student knowledge of paint & refinishing techniques. Again, students have performed very well in this exam. However, the CLO assessment tool structure has failed to collect data on the actual work performed by students. Finally, our review found that AUBDY 321 and 322 CLOs were not comprehensive and need to be expanded to ideally have 2-3 CLOs per course.

PROGRAM CHANGES MADE IN FY2012-13

In Summer of 2012, MJC held a college wide event on outcome assessment. The review efforts from this planning day recommended programmatic changes to the SRA: Auto Body Refinishing Program. These program adjustments were submitted to the MJC Curriculum Committee in Fall 2012.

ACTION PLAN

Based on this programmatic PLO and CLO evaluation the following action items have been identified.

1. AUBDY 321 and AUBDY 322 need to have 2-3 CLOs per course to fully capture the purpose of the course
2. Laboratory Assessments need to be developed linked to the CLOs that support PLO 2. Or specifically evaluate for PLO 2.

**Faculty Included in the Preparation and Sharing of this Report:**

Jeff Beebe, Auto Body Collision & Repair

Elizabeth Hondoy, Workforce Skills (Adjunct)

Gerald Wray, Automotive Technology

**Please provide a brief and cogent narrative in response to each of the following questions.**

1. Are the course learning outcomes (CLOs) on your spreadsheet accurate (as of right now), and do they represent the overall purpose(s) of the course(s)? *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes, the course learning outcomes (CLOs) on the current spreadsheet are accurate and are a proper representation of the “outcome” expectations for students that successfully complete each specific course area in the Skills Recognition: Auto Body Refinishing program. From our review meeting on April 26, 2013 held from 5:30pm to 8:00pm, our review group felt that AUBDY 301 had a sufficient level of specificity in its 2 CLOs listed for the course. However, we did agree that AUBDY 321 and 322 CLOs single CLO per course did not go far enough in representing the overall purpose of the courses. Further the CLOs seem to not clearly read as an outcome statement.

1. Are the program learning outcomes (PLOs) on your spreadsheet accurate (as of right now), and do they represent the overall purpose(s) of the program? *Please explain why or why not.*

Yes the program learning outcomes are accurate. Yes, the program learning outcomes are written to represent overarching statement of what successful student completers should be able to perform within the context of the SRA: Auto Body Refinishing program. Students in the Auto Body Refinishing program move through some very specific CTE courses that provide students with lecture content exposure and review about the industries safety and regulatory standards. This is a critical section of the curriculum that is vital for students to understand and be able to enter and succeed in the industry. However, the knowledge of “how to” only represents a portion of the outcomes for the programs. This is because in a Career Technical Education program “being able to do” is the most critical function of a successful program. Consider a person who is able to eloquently describe how to fix your vehicle and how to purchase the materials and determine professional labor targets to conduct work. This level of discussion provides a high degree of comfort. However, if the individual then tells you he/she has never actually used any piece of equipment or repaired or painted any vehicle. Would you then still have the same level of confidence that the work will be properly done?

This concept of PERFORMANCE is at the heart of all CTE Programs. PLO#2 speaks in broad terms to the ability to perform basic repairs in accordance to industry standards. In the Auto Body Industry those standards are driven and measured via points and/or certification by I-CAR and ASE. To this end, the assessment tests used confirms understanding of content knowledge, and specific course lab work assesses arrive point of the student’s ability to performance. It does not however, provide evidence that the student is actually able to do the work (this point will be discussed in later questions).

1. How well do the course learning outcomes (CLOs) fulfill, support and align with the program learning outcomes (PLOs)? Additionally, just in terms of the structure, do you think the assessment data from the CLOs can tell a qualitative *and* quantitative story about the PLOs? *Please explain, and take some time to think through and write about what kinds of PLO analysis your CLO assessments will foster.*

The CLOs align well to the 2 written PLOs in the SRA: Auto Body Refinishing Program. The I-CAR SP2 Collision Safety & Pollution Prevention Pollution Test provides the instructor with assessment data this is directly used and linked to industry standards. This assessment is a good gauge of student understanding of safety and environmental regulatory information. The ASE Practice (B2): Painting and Refinishing Assessment again provides students and the professor with a common assessment tool that aligns to ASE industry certification standards for students entering the Auto Body field. The information from our review confirms that students success in these assessment are understanding the needed material presented in lecture and reviewed in reading assignments.

Structurally, AUBDY 321 and 322 have too few CLOs to provide sufficient information for the proper assessment of program PLOs.

1. You’ve mapped your CLOs to PLOs. You’ve also been provided CLO assessment data in your packet. Now, take some time to reflect on, consider and analyze the data you have. This is not an easy section to complete, and the purpose of this pilot is to generate thoughtful reflection on—and assessment of—PLOs in relationship to our CLO assessment data.

Please look at every CLO data sheet included. Then, analyze, engage and write as much as you can, addressing the following question: ***what does your CLO data tell you about each of your PLOs?*** *Be detailed, descriptive and analytical.*

*As you consider this question…*

* + Discuss what kinds of trends you see in the data provided, and provide a qualitative assessment of each PLO.
  + Try to fill in the CLO data from each sheet on your spreadsheet, and attempt to come up with an aggregate percentage for your PLOs. Is it possible to give a PLO quantitative assessment based on all of the courses listed? Or, can you give a PLO quantitative assessment based only on your discipline/department courses?
  + **Please be thorough and provide as much reflection and analysis as possible. The more analysis, the better. Feel free to write beyond this page.**

Following the last evaluation review in Summer 2012, at the college wide event, faculty have updated the program to remove AUBDY 115 and AUBDY 399. The new SRA program has added AUBDY 301. The official changes take effect Summer 2013. Future assessments and reflection will inform the impact and value of this decision.

Reflection on trends the data has provided is as follows:

(a) PLO 1 regarding safety and environmental regulatory concern are being consistently met based on assessment information from AUBDY 301 and 321. Both courses use the same assessment tool to evaluate student knowledge in the subject.

(b) PLO 2 is evaluated using ASE Prep Test for Paint and Refinishing. The results confirm that students understand how to perform basic refinishing techniques.

Aggregated Data for PLOs – (a) PLO 1: Yes, based on assessment data collected 100% of students tested passed exam on safety and regulatory standards; (b) No. CLO information evaluates student knowledge of how to perform basic refinishing techniques. CLO assessment tools do not evaluate student application of techniques to industry standard. This would be found in quality of work expected from laboratory environments.

1. **Action Plan.** Based on the assessments and analysis you have provided in questions 1-4, please consider what changes or improvements you would like to make, which might include updating your CLO or PLO statements, modifying course outlines, rethinking instruction efforts, using different assessment instruments, etc. ***Based on the analysis you have provided in questions 1-4, provide an action plan for improvement that draws on your assessment results and efforts.***

ACTION 1: Identify and/or develop CLO assessment tools that evaluate student performance in addition to knowledge of for CLOs linked to PLO 2. It is anticipated that this will be found in the activities students perform in the lab.

ACTION 2: Ensure that AUBDY 321 and 322 have 2-3 student learning outcomes written. Presently, each course has only one CLO per course. The single CLO is not sufficient.

1. The college should be making improvements based on student learning outcomes assessment, and we need to continue to document and share the improvements and progress you have already made. *This is extremely important.*
   * Did you make any changes in your CLO or PLO statements during the last 4-year cycle that ended in 2012, or any changes this year? *Please explain what you accomplished.*
   * Did you make any improvements in the areas of teaching and instruction processes, your courses, or your program? *Please explain and provide details about your efforts!*

No changes have been made to the CLOs for the courses involved since the original statements were authored.

SRA Auto Body Refinishing programmatic changes were submitted and approved via the Curriculum Committee at MJC in the Fall 2012. These curricular changes followed the August 2012 college-wide assessment review process. The program removed AUBDY 115 (1 unit) and AUBDY 399 (1 unit), but added AUBDY 301 (5 units) to the program. This changed the total student from 7 units to 10 units.

Because of the various online testing tools being used that are aligned with I-CAR and ASE, the professor switched the lecture room the courses to a classroom with computers (Sierra 114). This classroom change has enhance the learning experience for students.

1. Please reflect on the process of learning outcomes assessment in your division and at Modesto Junior College. What do you think would make it more meaningful? How could it be improved? What would help you?

* Sharing of teaching strategies being used to improve student success or learning.
* Featuring a story each month on how specific instructors on campus are working to gather reflective information, implementing new teaching strategies, making environment changes to benefit student learning outcomes and program learning outcomes.