Course Assessment Report
Washtenaw Community College

Discipline	Course Number	Title
Auto Services (inactive)	258	ASV 258 10/25/2018-Engine Drivability
Division	Department	Faculty Preparer
Advanced Technologies and Public Service Careers	Automotive Services	Justin Carter
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: 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 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 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)
2018, 2017, 2016	2018, 2017, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
105	73

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.

Blackboard exam data was not available on Blackboard for the following sections: ASV 258 Winter 2017 and Fall 2018. NATEF tasklist data from completed student work order reports was not useable.

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.

Day and evening students on campus.

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

Exam scored by Blackboard with item analysis and NATEF checklist scoring rubric from CTE3.com

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
Assessment cannot be performed on the tools assigned to this outcome: no data available from the departmental exam or NATEF checklist.

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

There was no useable assessment data for this outcome to interpret.

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.

The exam questions did not seem to provide a strong assessment of this outcome. A performance-focused tool and a rubric should be used instead. A quiz given in the first week of class could help identify which students understand how to use the service manuals effectively.

Outcome 2: Diagnose and repair engine management electrical circuits.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
    - 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 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)
2018, 2016	2018, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
73	69

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.

Four students from the sample withdrew from 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.

Day and evening students on campus.

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

Exam question item analysis scored by Blackboard.

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 of 69 students (55%) answered the questions correctly. The standard of success was not met.

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

The departmental exam questions seemed to accurately measure the students' ability to gain an introductory level of drivability diagnosis.

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 need more instruction time to learn how use to the latest engine management diagnostic techniques with the latest scan tool software. A quiz in the first class will help identify the degree to which students understand how to use the scan tools correctly.

Outcome 3: Diagnose and repair engine codes.

- Assessment Plan

- Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
- Assessment Date: Fall 2011
- 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 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)
2016	2018, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
54	43

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.

Four students from the sample withdrew from the class;

- six students did not complete question 1.
- five students did not complete question 2.
- six students did not complete question 3.

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.

Day and evening students on campus.

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

Departmental exam scored by Blackboard with item analysis.

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
35 out of 43 (81%) students answered question 1 correctly. 40 out of 45 (88%) students answered question 2 correctly. 35 out of 44 (79%) students answered question 3 correctly.

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

The questions adequately measured the students' ability to diagnose engine fault codes and showed they could follow through with the correct repair sequence.

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.

The assessment process identified areas of strength for this outcome. Only minor outcome language revision is needed to ensure continued course improvement.

Outcome 4: Demonstrate the proper use of scan tools and processes when diagnosing fuel, electrical and emission systems.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Common departmental exam; NATEF checklist
    - Assessment Date: Fall 2011
    - 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 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)
2016	2018, 2016	

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

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
54	43

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.

Four students from the sample withdrew from the class;

- six students did not complete question 1.
- seven students did not complete question 2.
- five students did not complete question 3.

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.

Day and evening students on campus.

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

Departmental exam scored by Blackboard with item analysis.

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
35 out of 43 (81%) students answered question 1 correctly. 31 out of 43 (72%) students answered question 2 correctly. 39 out of 45 (86%) students answered question 3 correctly.

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

The written exam questions seemed to adequately gauge the students' ability to diagnose defective engine management components using scan tools.

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.

The assessment process identified areas of strength for this outcome. Only minor outcome language revision is needed to ensure continued course improvement.

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 assessment report.

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?

Outcomes intended to meet the needs of the students were satisfactory with room for improvement. Having taught this course several semesters, my impression is that the student achievement results need to have a higher level of success for all outcomes.

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

The results of the assessment report will be shared with departmental faculty via google drive once the review and approval process is complete.

4. Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Revise outcome 1 language; more detail and stronger verbiage concerning service information.	Revise outcome language to obtain a better measure of student learning.	2019
Assessment Tool	Delete NATEF tasklist as assessment tool in outcomes 1 through 4.	Cannot use data from CTE3.com to assess student learning outcomes.	2019
Objectives	Add objectives to match outcomes; minimum 3 objectives per outcome.	Follow assessment committee recommendation.	2019
Pre-requisite	Add ASV 131 OR 133 as prerequisite.	Need to make change for new program.	2019
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Update textbook edition to #7.	Later textbook edition released.	2019

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

The department will be taking measures to author our own texts, lab books and course pack materials. This along with the addition of WCC instructor-written departmental exams on Blackboard should help to improve the process of aggregating assessment data.

III. Attached Files

Outcome #4/Question 2/ Fall 2016
NATEF checklist CTE3.com Rubic Example
Outcome #3/Question 2/ Fall 2016
Outcome #3/Question 2/ Winter 2018
Outcome #3/Question 3/ Winter 2016
Outcome #3/Question 3/ Fall 2016
Outcome #3/Question 3/ Winter 2016
Outcome #3/Question 3/ Winter 2018
Outcome #4/Question 2/ Winter 2018
Outcome #4/Question 2/ Winter 2016
Outcome #4/Question 3/ Winter 2016

Outcome #4/Question 3/ Fall 2016
Outcome #4/Question 3/ Winter 2018
Outcome 3&4 /Question 1/ Winter 2016
Outcome 3&4 /Question 1/ Fall 2016
Outcome 3&4 /Question 1/ Winter 2018
Outcome #2 Question

Faculty/Preparer:	Justin Carter	**Date:** 04/27/2019
Department Chair:	Justin Morningstar	**Date:** 04/29/2019
Dean:	Brandon Tucker	**Date:** 05/19/2019
Assessment Committee Chair:	Shawn Deron	**Date:** 07/09/2019