

The Diesel Service Technology program review was presented in February of 2009. DST Faculty and support staff welcomed PCC Administrators and staff to the Diesel Technology Lab/Classroom at the Rock creek campus where the program is housed. At that presentation, DST faculty presented the contents of the 2008 DST Program Review document, providing additional supporting information and answering questions.

This Administrative Response will: A) note particular highlights of the Program Review, B) identify work still to be completed, and C) pose some questions for further consideration.

Of Particular Note

Interaction & Collaboration with Industry:

We wish to particularly acknowledge and commend the DST faculty for the extent to which they have partnered with industry to provide realistic and effective learning experiences for students, as evidenced by the following:

- Commitment and adherence to ASE/NATEF industry certification for curriculum and faculty
- Industry driven competency based course outcomes which require students to “do” in addition to “describe”
- Embedded “real life/work” assignments such as resumes and technical reports
- Affiliation agreement with Bobcat of America
- Charter members, Northwest Diesel Industry Council
- Advisory Committee with significant and extensive industry participation
- Significant equipment donations from a variety of industry partners
- Arrangements with vendors to provide students with tools at large discount
- Industry participation in outreach activities such as Diesel Day
- Industry based scholarships for students
- On-going industry training for faculty

Commitment to Students

This Program Review, particularly the interactive portion given in February, made it evident that faculty in this program are deeply committed to the success of the DST students. The motto of the program seems to be, “if we can get them in the lab, we can get them excited about learning.” They create an atmosphere which is open and inviting for the less experienced student, or the student that has perhaps not been particularly successful in prior educational attempts. This plays out in both the attitude of the instructors and also the design of the

curriculum, which replaces pre-requisites with competency-based exit requirements.

(While an “Administrative Response” is not the typical place for a remembrance, it seems wrong to talk about commitment to students and not mention instructor Ken Ottwell who passed away this past July. Colleagues note that Ken always was willing to spend extra time with students who struggled, and I am certain he made a big difference in the lives of many. I know the DST faculty and staff will continue to miss Ken.)

Needs Completion

There are some items needed from DST for documentation, accreditation and state compliance and reporting. Some disciplines provide this information in conjunction with the Program Review process. The following items are needed by the PCC Office of Academic and Student Affairs (for which your contact is Dean of Instructional Support, Kendra Cawley):

Degree and Certificate outcomes: DST noted that degree & certificate outcomes had been completed. If so, they must be submitted to the Curriculum Office (as a program revision). There are guidelines on the Curriculum Office website <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/academic/eac/degree/dc-outcomes-guidelines.html> and/or help in refining outcomes from Sally Earll in the Curriculum office.

Course Outcomes: It was clear from your presentation and discussions (and implicit in ASE/NATEF certification) that your courses are very outcomes/competencies based. The course outcomes as listed in your CCOG’s however, do not fully reflect your competencies based approach, and need some tweaking. Accreditation based guidelines have shifted over time, with a growing emphasis towards more specific outcomes language. We don’t believe that revising your outcomes will be particularly difficult or time consuming, but it does need to be done. (Again, guidelines are on the Curriculum Office website and Sally will help.)

Related Instruction. During the review, you shared with us your use of Related Instruction. We were very impressed with your thoughtful and well-executed RI strategies, and recall you were very early adopters in bringing embedded math, reading and writing into curriculum. In order to document and “showcase” your use of RI, there is a RI document/template that must be completed (for 2 yr and 1 yr certificates \geq 44 cr) and submitted to the Curriculum process.

DS 107. We have learned, relatively recently, that our CTE courses must be in degrees and certificates, not “stand alone”. We would like you to consult with Kendra Cawley to explore how you might redefine the standing of this course in your program to be in compliance with state requirements.

Further Consideration

At the conclusion of this program review cycle, the consensus of this Administrative response is:

- Diesel Technology is a model and well-designed program with a real commitment to continuous improvement and student success, and;
- The written report as submitted does not fully reflect the strengths of this program.

We are very impressed with the work of DST, and over time would like to see a stronger program review report that includes more data, analysis, and discussion. Typically, program reviews can serve as planning guides and as a place for faculty to make recommendations and ask for support and resources. Normally the administrative response is a place to give feedback on those plans and resources requests. We are unable to do so as the report did not include a recommendations section. Additionally, the program review process and document is the “external face” of programs to at least some stakeholders, since the finals reports are posted to the web. We would like the rest of the PCC and the external community to be as impressed as we were during the DST presentation/discussion meeting. Thank you for sharing your work with us via the program review process, and for the interactive discussion about all of your work.