Administrative Response to Program Review
Auto Collision Repair Technology Program
December 2016

On December 2, 2016, the Auto Collision Repair Technology SAC presented their Program Review findings to an audience of PCC administrators and others with an interest in the discipline. The presentation was informative and thought provoking. It provided an opportunity for engagement with those in attendance through an informative and interactive dialogue.

This Administrative Response will: A) note particular highlights of the Auto Collision Repair Technology Program and Program Review; B) provide observations and recommendations; and C) provide the administrative response to the SAC recommendations.

Noteworthy Efforts or Achievements

- Kudos for an excellent program review presentation. The presentation was engaging and demonstrated the commitment of the faculty and staff to student success and opportunity. It was well planned and balanced between faculty and staff. The gift bags with program swag were a fun touch. Thank you!
- Effective collaboration with CTE advisor to work on a student retention and follow-up practice/protocol.
- The SAC deserves recognition for work in recruitment and retention strategies, restructuring of the schedule, and the service learning activities of the Bare Metals Club. The detail provided on the I-CAR accreditation, how it is woven into coursework and the financial support offered to the ACR students is also noteworthy. The absence of these topics from the published report seems like a missed opportunity for sharing great ideas with the rest of the college and with external stakeholders.
- Kudos on the development of the Career Encounters course in cooperation with the other CTE areas and CG. We are also impressed with your willingness to work with faculty to replicate this model in other career areas and at other campuses. It would be interesting to see how this programming might be made available to returning students, or GED students.
- ACR's system for assessment is one of the best in the college, using an approach that is comprehensive with regards to technical skills and soft skills that map to the College Core Outcomes, and are presented in a manner that allows the program to systematically identify struggling students and/or areas of instruction that would be targets for improvement. However, it was surprising that the Program Review referenced only 2011 results and described the same plans for improvement identified in that pilot year. We recognize that annual assessment reports have reported data each year, with thoughtful appraisal of the results each year. The results for each year were included (Appendix 6), but not summarized or even referenced in the Program Review document. This is not only a missed opportunity for showcasing the program's continued attention to assessment, but makes it look as though the program has NOT been attending to this

important work (it would not be obvious to accreditation evaluations to look more closely at the annual assessment reporting if results are not summarized in the Program Review).
- Community and college engagement including the work on the Rock Creek entrance sign and logo.
- Updating of the tool room.
- Donation of equipment from vendors.
- State-of-the-Art Paint Booths and Virtual Paint Simulator
- Bare Metals Club activities including students winning national awards.

Observations and Recommendations

SACs are asked to adhere to the outline for the academic year in which they report so that important program-level information can be located efficiently. Some of this is needed for accreditation reporting, or to put enrollment concerns or budgetary requests into context, or to identify and direct college resources and supports appropriately. In the report prepared for 2016, Auto Collision Repair did not use the outline, which made locating information difficult. Some important information was included but not in the section where it would be logically looked for (e.g., Barriers to Completion) and some information was not supplied at all (e.g., the I-CAR integration of online certifications).

In addition, there were several parts of the document in which the content was not significantly updated from the 2011 report. For example:

- The entire section on Learning/Technical skill assessment, pp 6-9, was only slightly changed from the 2011 version, including reference to the scores of three students, and the "new" scoring rubric, and does not reference any more recent assessment results or improvement to teaching and learning.
- The section on barriers to completion was nearly identical to that presented in 2011. Have there been no changes?
- In the Program Review report, frequent mention was made of challenges in finding co-op sites for students. (Note: these were nearly the same comments as were raised in the 2011 report.) But interestingly, co-op education challenges were not mentioned in the presentation and the discussion around super shops, which are not only rising significantly as a fraction of the industry, but were noted as being much more willing than smaller shops to take students in co-op education. So, is it still a problem?

The specific recommendations identified during the presentation were not outlined in the Program Review. It would be helpful for the program to revise this section to include those specific recommendations, including:

1. Equipment Needs
   - Bronze Welders
   - Self-Piercing Riveter
   - Aluminum Tooling

2. Classroom Sound and Lighting

Recommendation: The DOIs request that the ACR SAC revise the program review document and resubmit it in **June 2017**. Specifically, we ask you to do the following:

Required:

- Revise the document to organize the text into elements of the outline.
- Update section 2C, following the prompts in the outline, to reflect on the assessment over the last 5 years.
- Supply responses to questions that were not addressed in the original review.
- Update the Recommendations section to include the priorities described during the presentation to they can become part of the record of program review.

Recommended: Add topics that were covered in the presentation but not in the original review. If they do not have an obvious home in the program review outline, they can be included as an added item at the end of any section.

Administrative Response to Auto Collision Repair Technology Recommendations

1. The fleet of ACR owned shop vehicles needs to be updated, some are starting to show their age. *We are aware of and support the need for the regular replacement of equipment. Please work with your division dean to ensure this request is identified on the division equipment replacement spreadsheet. In addition, we recommend ensuring that the advisory committee is aware of the need for newer shop vehicles so that they can encourage donations to the program. Lastly, please continue working with the PCC Foundation in their efforts to develop funding for major capital equipment.*

2. The PCC ACR Facebook page needs more continuous attention and updating. *We support updating the Facebook page. Please work with your division dean to identify resources to assist you with the updates.*

3. A method for tracking program graduates and their post-PCC employment is badly needed. *We support the importance of tracking graduates. Please work with Institutional Effectiveness on this recommendation.*

4. A method for tracking current program students and making sure that they are finishing the program (student retention form). *We support student retention and agree that it is important to track program students and assist them with completion of the program. Please work closely with your Learning Skills Specialist who can assist with this recommendation.*

5. I-CAR welding certification. I-CAR offers a special welding certification; faculty is working to meet strict guidelines to be able to offer this. *We support this certification and encourage faculty to meet the guidelines and obtain this approval.*

Closing

In closing, we want to again thank the Auto Collision Repair Technology SAC for sharing the results of your program review with us. We enjoyed learning more about the discipline, your successes and plans for the future. We look forward to supporting your on-going work on continuous program improvement.

Administrative Response submitted by Cheryl L. Scott, on behalf of the Deans of Instruction and Dean of Academic Affairs.

Kendra Cawley, Dean of Academic Affairs
Craig Kolins, Dean of Instruction Southeast Campus
Karen Paez, Interim Dean of Instruction Sylvania Campus
Cheryl Scott, Dean of Instruction Rock Creek Campus
Kurt Simonds, Dean of Instruction Cascade Campus