

**Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College**

| Discipline | Course Number | Title |
|---|---------------------|---|
| Auto Services (inactive) | 134 | ASV 134 05/01/2019- Automotive Transmissions |
| Division | Department | Faculty Preparer |
| Advanced Technologies and Public Service Careers | Automotive Services | Thomas Hemsteger |
| Date of Last Filed Assessment Report | | |

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Recognize, diagnose and repair a basic automatic transmission.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmental exam and NATEF performance tasks
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Common departmental exam will be scored using an answer sheet. NATEF checklist will be scored using the departmentally-developed rubric.

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score an overall average of 70% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2018 | 2019 | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 54 | 24 |

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.

For this assessment report, exam data was only available from one faculty member. Plans are being made to collect data from all faculty teaching sections of this course for the next assessment report.

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 sections of this course are taught face-to-face.

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

We administered an embedded departmental exam and students completed a NATEF checklist in the students' personal self-evaluation portal. The departmental exam had 46 questions and the exam was scored using an answer key. The NATEF checklist is pass/fail and did not yield any meaningful data because it doesn't flesh out individual areas of improvement or success.

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: Yes

Department exam: 96% of students passed with a score of 70% or above, which yields a 96% success rate.

NATEF - 100% passed, but because the data could not yield meaningful results, we need to look at a different tool such as a checklist.

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

96% of the students were able to recognize, diagnose and repair automatic transmissions based on the departmental exam questions and the NATEF checklist.

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.

Provide more classroom review time for sample exam test questions. We will also provide more demonstrations in the lab to improve diagnosis success.

Outcome 2: Recognize, diagnose and repair a basic manual transmission.

- Assessment Plan
 - Assessment Tool: Departmental exam and NATEF performance tasks
 - Assessment Date: Fall 2015
 - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
 - Number students to be assessed: All students
 - How the assessment will be scored: Common departmental exam will be scored using an answer sheet. NATEF checklist will be scored using the departmentally-developed rubric.
 - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score an overall average of 70% or higher.
 - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty

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) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 2018 | 2019 | |

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

| # of students enrolled | # of students assessed |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 54 | 24 |

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.

For this assessment report, exam data was only available from one faculty member. Plans are being made to collect data from all faculty teaching sections of this course for the next assessment report.

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 sections of this course are taught face-to-face.

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

The departmental exam was administered to all students. This was a multiple choice exam. The questions were formatted to include parts and terminology recognition, diagnosis problems and repair procedures. The exam was scored using a percentage of correct responses based on the total number of questions. The NATEF checklist is pass/fail and did not provide meaningful data.

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: Yes

92% of the students achieved a score of 70% or higher on the departmental exam.

NATEF - 100% passed, but because the data could not yield meaningful results, we need to look at a different tool such as a checklist.

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

92% of the students could recognize, diagnose, and repair manual transmissions based on the departmental exam and the NATEF checklist.

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.

Provide additional classroom review time with sample exam questions. We will also provide more demonstrations to improve diagnosis success.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

No previous report available

2. 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?

The course is meeting the needs of the students based on their readiness to pass the departmental exam (which mimics the State of MI and ASE certification exams) with a success rate of 70% or higher.

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

The report is available to all full time departmental faculty.

- 4.

Intended Change(s)

| Intended Change | Description of the change | Rationale | Implementation Date |
|-----------------|--|--|---------------------|
| Assessment Tool | Remove NATEF student checklist from both outcomes and add another tool, most likely a departmental skills checklist. | We are unable to access meaningful detailed data from the NATEF checklist for individual students. While the data does show the student completed each task, nothing is recorded that identifies areas of strength or weakness. Without this information, it is difficult to | 2020 |

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | identify areas for improvement. | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|--|

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

| |
|----|
| 6. |
|----|

III. Attached Files

[grade book](#)

Faculty/Preparer: Thomas Hemsteger **Date:** 05/06/2019
Department Chair: Justin Morningstar **Date:** 05/17/2019
Dean: Brandon Tucker **Date:** 05/19/2019
Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 08/19/2019