

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Auto Body Repair	135	ABR 135 03/31/2016- Collision-Related Mechanical and Electrical Repairs
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Advanced Technologies and Public Service Careers	Automotive Body	Scott Malnar
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Identify principles of mechanical and electrical repair issues.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Final Exam
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
14	13

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

One student dropped the course. All other students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All students were assessed. This course is offered only in a face-to-face setting.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students were given a written final exam covering the content of the entire course. The exam was scored using an answer key. NATEF has identified 85% as their standard of excellence. The Auto Body department is using the same standard.

Student success in the course is actually considered a "C" which equates to 70%. Results for both standards are identified in the text of this report.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

38% (5 of 13) of the students scored 85% or higher on the final exam. WCC did not meet the standard of success according to NATEF standards.

69% (9 of 13) of the students scored 70% or higher on the final exam. This does not meet the standard of success identified for this course.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

38% (5 of 13) students met 85%, the standard of success for this outcome. This does not meet the standard of success. It is difficult to identify areas of strength and weakness on the exam because the data is not broken down by content area.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

For the exam, the students did not meet the standard of success. It is difficult to identify areas of strength and weakness on the exam because the data is not broken down by content area.

Outcome 2: Analyze auto body components and determine needed repairs or replacement.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student Achievement Record and Final Exams.
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
14	13

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Only one section of the course was taught. One student dropped the course. All other students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All students were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Students took a written final exam. Questions related to all 13 areas covered in this course were included in the exam.

A Student Achievement Record, covering 13 areas was used to assess the student performance in the lab component of this course. The achievement records was scored using a rubric of 1-5, with a score of 5 being highest. If a student did not complete the task, we excluded their score (0) from the calculation of the task average.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

38% (5 of 13) of students scored 85% or higher on the final exam. 69% (9 of 13) of students scored 70% or higher on the exam. Neither of these meet the standard of success.

Students scored 85% (4.25 of 5) or higher in two of the 13 content areas. This calculates to a 15% success rate. Students scored 70% or higher (3.5 of 5) or higher in eight of the 13 content areas. This results in a 62% success rate.

This does not meet the standard of success

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

38% (5 of 13) students met 85%, the standard of success for this outcome. This does not meet the standard of success. It is difficult to identified areas of strength and weakness on the exam because the data is not broken down by content area.

Students scored an average of 85% or higher (4.25) on 2 of the 13 content areas in the achievement record. The students scored highest on safety, steering and suspension.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

38% (5 of 13) students met 85%, the standard of success for this outcome. This does not meet the standard of success. It is difficult to identified areas of strength and weakness on the exam because the data is not broken down by content area.

Students scored an average of 85% or higher (4.25) on 2 of the 13 content areas in the achievement record. The students scored lower on AC, exhaust, wheels and advanced systems.

Outcome 3: Perform necessary repairs in accordance w/safety standards as instructed.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Student Achievement Record
 - Assessment Date: Winter 2009
 - Course section(s)/other population: all
 - Number students to be assessed: all
 - How the assessment will be scored:
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment:
 - Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
	2016	

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
14	13

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

Only one section of the course was taught. One student dropped the course. All other students were assessed.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

All students were assessed.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

A Student Achievement Record, covering 13 content areas, was used to assess the student performance in the lab component of this course. The achievement records was scored using a rubric of 1-5, with a score of 5 being highest. If a student did not complete the task, we excluded their score (0) from the calculation of the task average.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: No

Students scored 85% (4.25 of 5) or higher in 2 of the 13 content areas. This calculates to a 15% success rate. Students scored 70% or higher (3.5 of 5) or higher in 8 of the 13 content areas. This results in a 62% success rate.

This does not meet the standard of success.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

Students scored an average of 85% or higher (4.25) on 2 of the 13 content areas in the achievement record. The students scored highest on safety, steering and suspension.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Students scored an average of 85% or higher (4.25) on 2 of the 13 content areas in the achievement record. The students scored lower on AC, exhaust, wheels and advanced systems.

II. Course Summary and Action Plans Based on Assessment Results

1. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

Fewer than 80% of the students are achieving the requirements of an entry-level technician.

Exhaust and advanced systems were subjects that had low scores even after removing all zeros for missing quizzes due to low attendance on those days.

2. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

All information will be shared at a department meeting.

- 3.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	We will perform an item analysis on the exam and identify questions where fewer than 70% of the students correctly answered the question.	An item analysis will help us identify areas of weakness on the exam as well as review the exam questions to identify ones that may need revised.	2017
1st Day Handout	Stress the importance of attendance.	Due to the amount of information that can't be revisited it is crucial the student attends all classes.	2017
Course Assignments	Increase the number of course assignments that need to be completed prior to the next class.	With 13 topics, the content changes so rapidly that retention becomes a problem. Therefore more practice following the course could improve retention.	2017
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Add more detailed handouts of the topics covered each week. Investigate making CDs available to students using Blackboard.	NATEF provides CDs on the content area to be covered. We could investigate the possibility of making those available to students through Blackboard. Further, we could revise the handouts to provide additional detail so they can be better	2017

		used as study guides for the final exam.	
--	--	---	--

4. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

5.

III. Attached Files

[ABR 135 data](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Scott Malnar **Date:** 09/28/2016
Department Chair: Gary Sobbry **Date:** 10/21/2016
Dean: Brandon Tucker **Date:** 11/02/2016
Assessment Committee Chair: Michelle Garey **Date:** 12/06/2016