Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Auto Services (inactive)	254	ASV 254 06/11/2019-Suspension and Steering
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Advanced Technologies and Public Service Careers	Automotive Services	Jeremiah Pfahlert
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		11/27/2017

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

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

   Yes

   This course was previously assessed in 2017.

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

   Student performance was excellent in the previous report, and some changes were indicated.

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

   It was noted that some students were not completing the homework. It was also noted that the purchase of a "Road Force Tire Balancer" could improve student learning.

   The homework issue has been addressed by the use of a Blackboard site. This allows the instructor to more closely monitor the student's homework progress in real time with alerts. A "Road Force Tire Balancer" was never purchased.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Evaluate steering and suspension system components for wear and damage.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Written Exam
  - Assessment Date: Winter 2019

- Course section(s)/other population: All sections
- Number students to be assessed: All students
- How the assessment will be scored: Answer key
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 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, 2017	2019	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
53	53

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.

All students from the Fall of '17, Fall of '18 and Winter of '19 are being 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.

Full sections of students are being assessed from face-to-face classes only. Both morning and evening classes are represented in this sample.

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

[5] Superior (100-90%) [4] Excellent (89-70%) [3] Average (69-60%) [2] Below Average (59% and below)

[1] Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool.

The standard of success for this outcome is at least 70% of students will score an average of 70% or higher.

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

[5] Superior (100-90%) = 19 students

[4] Excellent (89-70%) = 23 students

[3] Average (69-60%) = 8 students

[2] Below Average (59% and below) = 1 students

[1] Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. = 2 students

The standard of success was met for this outcome, as 79.24% of students scored 70% or higher.

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

Students are able to identify defective parts on the vehicle as well as identify their symptoms on written tests.

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 are currently performing well in this area. In the future the NATEF checklist will be removed as an assessment tool due to lack of information sharing by NATEF.

Outcome 1: Evaluate steering and suspension system components for wear and damage.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Practical Exam

- Assessment Date: Winter 2019
- Course section(s)/other population: All sections
- Number students to be assessed: All students
- How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 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, 2017	2019	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
53	53

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.

All students from Fall of '17, Fall of '18 and Winter of '19 are being 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.

Full sections of students are being assessed from face-to-face classes only. Both morning and evening classes are represented in this sample.

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

[1] Pass [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. The standard of success for this outcome is at least 70% of students will score an average of 70% or higher.

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
[1] Pass = 46 Students [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. = 7 students The standard of success was met for this outcome, as 86.79% of students scored 70% or higher.

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

Students are able to identify defective parts on the vehicle as well as identify their symptoms on written tests.

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 are currently performing well in this area. In the future the NATEF checklist will be removed as an assessment tool due to lack of information sharing by NATEF.

Outcome 2: Remove and install steering and suspension system components.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Lab assignment sheets
    - Assessment Date: Winter 2019
    - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
    - Number students to be assessed: All students
    - How the assessment will be scored: Skills checklist
    - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 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, 2017	2019	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
53	53

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.

All students from Fall of '17, Fall of '18 and Winter of '19 are being 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.

Full sections of students are being assessed from face-to-face classes only. Both morning and evening classes are represented in this sample.

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

[1] Pass [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. The standard of success for this outcome is at least 70% of students will score an average of 70% or higher.

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
[1] Pass = 48 students [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. = 5 students

The standard of success was met for this outcome, as 90.56% of students scored 70% or higher.

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

Students are currently showing proficiency in the removal and replacement of suspension components.

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 are currently performing well in this area. In the future the NATEF checklist will be removed as an assessment tool due to lack of information sharing by NATEF.

Outcome 3: Perform vehicle pre-alignment inspection.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Practical Exam
    - Assessment Date: Winter 2019
    - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
    - Number students to be assessed: All students
    - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
    - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 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, 2017	2019	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
53	53

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.

All students from Fall of '17, Fall of '18 and Winter of '19 are being 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.

Full sections of students are being assessed from face-to-face classes only. Both morning and evening classes are represented in this sample.

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

[1] Pass [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. The standard of success for this outcome is at least 70% of students will score an average of 70% or higher.

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
[1] Pass = 43 students [2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. = 10 students The standard of success was met for this outcome, as 81.13% of students scored 70% or higher.

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

Students are currently showing proficiency in the pre-alignment inspection of suspension components.

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 are currently performing well in this area. In the future the NATEF checklist will be removed as an assessment tool due to lack of information sharing by NATEF.

Outcome 4: Perform vehicle alignments procedure.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Practical Exam
    - Assessment Date: Winter 2019
    - Course section(s)/other population: All sections
    - Number students to be assessed: All students
    - How the assessment will be scored: Departmentally-developed rubric
    - Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of students will score 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, 2017	2019	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
53	53

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.

All students from Fall of '17, Fall of '18 and Winter of '19 are being 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.

Full sections of students are being assessed from face-to-face classes only. Both morning and evening classes are represented in this sample.

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

[1] Pass

[2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool.

The standard of success for this outcome is at least 70% of students will score an average of 70% or higher.

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

[1] Pass = 43 students

[2] Fail - Incomplete N/A Not Available for viewing/Evaluation or did not complete assessment tool. = 10 students

The standard of success was met for this outcome, as 81.13% of students scored 70% or higher.

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

Students are currently showing proficiency in the execution of a calibrated alignment of suspension components.

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 are currently performing well in this area. In the future the NATEF checklist will be removed as an assessment tool due to lack of information sharing by NATEF.

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.

Student's homework completion rate was improved due to the use of the use of the blackboard site.

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?

At this time this course seems to be meeting the student's needs. Students' grades are acceptable in both the book and hands-on aspects of this class. Going forward the assessment tool will be realigned to remove the NATEF checklist.

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

This report will be reviewed by the department chair and discussed in a department meeting.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Assessment Tool	The NTEF checklist will be removed from the assessment tool.	NATEF has changed their information sharing policy and this can no longer be used as a part of the assessment tool.	2020

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

6.

III. Attached Files

ASV_254_f17
ASV_254_f18
ASV_254_w19

Faculty/Preparer:	Jeremiah Pfahlert	**Date:**	06/27/2019
Department Chair:	Justin Morningstar	**Date:**	08/07/2019
Dean:	Brandon Tucker	**Date:**	09/12/2019

Assessment Committee Chair: Shawn Deron **Date:** 06/16/2020

Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Auto Services	254	ASV 254 11/21/2016-Suspension and Steering
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Advanced Technologies and Public Service Careers	Automotive Services	Thomas Hemsteger
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Read and interpret vehicle service manuals.

- Assessment Plan
  - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
  - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
  - Course section(s)/other population: All students enrolled
  - Number students to be assessed: Approximately 30 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 students will score an average of 70% or higher.
  - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will blind-score data when possible.

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)
	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	18

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 did not complete the course

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 offered were assessed.

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

In order to perform the suspension and steering inspection, students had to be able to read and interpret the vehicle and service manual. Student were scored on their performance of the inspection. Students reported their findings to the instructor and they were scored using a checkoff list. This checkoff list was scored as pass or fail.

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
18 students scored a 20 of 20 on their checkoff list. They were able to evaluate the vehicle and identify all areas that needed service. Different vehicles are evaluated using different procedures which are outlined in the service manual. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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

100% of the students met the outcomes. They were able to evaluate the vehicle and identify all areas that needed service. Different vehicles are evaluated using different procedures which are outlined in the service manual. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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.

All students met the standard of success.

Outcome 2: Diagnose steering and suspension issues.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
    - Course section(s)/other population: All students enrolled
    - Number students to be assessed: Approximately 30 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 students will score an average of 70% or higher.
    - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will blind-score data when possible.

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)
	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	18

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 did not complete the course

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 offered were assessed.

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

Students performed five tasks as part of diagnosing steering and suspension issues. Each task was scored on as pass/fail and students who passed were awarded 20 points. The five scores were added up for a total score on this outcome. In order to be successful, students had to achieve a score of 70 or higher.

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
14 students scored 70 or higher on their checkoff lists. This exceed the minimum requirement of 70% of students (13) scoring 70% or higher. Students were able to diagnose five different conditions on the vehicle. Ten students scored 100 on the total checklist while four scored 80. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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

Students were able to diagnose five different conditions on the vehicle. Ten students scored 100 on the total checklist while four scored 80. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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 had the most difficulty with the diagnosis and repair of steering return to center. They also had more difficulty diagnosing and repairing vehicle wandering. These issues are less common and can result from multiple causes. Therefore, students have to rule out tire and wheel causes.

Outcome 3: Remove and replace steering gears, racks, pumps and linkages. Remove and replace front and rear suspension components.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
    - Course section(s)/other population: All students enrolled
    - Number students to be assessed: Approximately 30 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 students will score an average of 70% or higher.
- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will blind-score data when possible.

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)
	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	18

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 did not complete the course

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 offered were assessed.

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

Students performed two tasks as part of removing and replacing steering gears, racks, pumps and linkages. They also removed and replaced front and rear suspension components. Each task was scored on as pass/fail and students who passed were awarded 20 points. The two scores were added up for a total score on this outcome. In order to be successful, students had to achieve a score of 28 or higher.

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
16 students (88%) scored 40 on their checkoff lists. This exceed the minimum requirement of 70% of students (13) scoring 70% (28) or higher. Students were able to perform front and rear suspension services. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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

Students performed two tasks as part of removing and replacing steering gears, racks, pumps and linkages. They also removed and replaced front and rear suspension components. Students performed very well on the front suspension service, scoring 100%. Sixteen students performed well on the rear suspension service tasks. Overall, these are excellent results.

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.

Because student performed so well on these tasks, no areas for improvement can be identified.

Outcome 4: Perform wheel alignments on vehicles.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
    - Course section(s)/other population: All students enrolled
    - Number students to be assessed: Approximately 30 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 students will score an average of 70% or higher.
    - Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will blind-score data when possible.

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)

	2015	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	18

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 did not complete the course

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 offered were assessed.

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

Students performed three tasks as part of various wheel alignments. Each task was scored on as pass/fail and students who passed were awarded 20 points. The three scores were added up for a total score on this outcome. In order to be successful, students had to achieve a score of 40 or higher.

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
16 students (88%) scored 40 or higher on their checkoff lists. This exceed the minimum requirement of 70% of students (13) scoring 70% (40) or higher. Students were able to perform three levels of wheel alignments. This demonstrates their ability to meet this student learning outcome.

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

There were three, progressively more difficult, levels of wheel alignment. Students performed extremely well on the 4-wheel alignments and the 4-wheel alignment when the tires had rear toe.

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.

More students had difficulty performing 4-wheel service with special parts. After-market repair parts can be used to improve vehicle alignment. This is more challenging for students, often because it is time consuming in order to get it aligned correctly.

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?

Students performed very well. When students diagnosed and repaired the vehicle wander, we recognized that a "Road Force Tire Balancer" would improve their performance. Since this equipment is not currently available, we may discuss purchasing it.

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

Department will discuss this information at a departmental meeting.

3. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Other: Evaluate online homework performance	In the process of assessing this course, we identified that a number of students did not complete their homework or scored poorly on those tasks. We will investigate why students are not performing well and identify some ways to improve their performance.	To promote student success.	2018

Other: Road Force Tire Balancer	We may request that the college purchase a new piece of equipment that would help student perform tire balancing better.	New equipment would help student perform tire balancing better.	2018

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

5.

III. Attached Files

ASV 254 data

Faculty/Preparer:	Thomas Hemsteger	**Date:**	03/22/2017
Department Chair:	Allen Day	**Date:**	05/10/2017
Dean:	Brandon Tucker	**Date:**	06/21/2017
Assessment Committee Chair:	Michelle Garey	**Date:**	11/27/2017