Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019

Program: Automotive Industry Management

(Due: May 21, 2019)

Date report completed: May 21, 2019

Completed by: Cathi J Robbe AIM Program Coordinator

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): Bill Bencini AIM Assistant Professor
Alan Fass AIM Lecturer

Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., and M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html. Thank you.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #2 will be addressed several times in required AIM courses as shown in Table 1. The Business Contact and Case Study Report will be evaluated against a rubric to evaluate the effectiveness, comprehension and competence level.	Spring 2015	A rubric was used to evaluate student presentation skills based on information, research, and knowledge of subject matter, format/layout of slides, speech/communication speed, dress and ability to answer questions. Business contacts were made throughout the spring semester to local dealerships. Students were expected to "job shadow" associates at the dealership for the learning experience and provide feedback on SWOT (strength,	Fall 2018 AIM 305 Regularity Issues had an enrollment of 15 students. Spring 19 AIM 425 Automotive Financial Manamgent had an enrollment of 15 students all junior or senior standing	Expectations of proficiency is 80% or higher for all AIM Students Learning Outcomes	Business Contact Reports were higher than the last assessment period. This is due in part to placing students at dealership to "job shadow" for an extend time rather that all touring different dealerships Case Study Reports this varied, not do to the assessment or rubric plan but lack of enthusiasm among	Over all the faculty observation of student participation and feedback was positive. Dealership personal who assisted in the:" job shadow" had mostly positive comments about student participation. A more formal survey will be given to dealer contact people to evaluate and improve on the new teaching style. At this time this information is not available	Continue to development of "job shadowing" and possibly internships so student can gain more hands on experience. This will potentially work well with the President Leadership Committee, AIM is already involved in temporary placement of students at City Fleet Maintenance for course credit

		weaknesses, opportunities and threat) of the business			some students, a few in this class just were not motivated, this is reflected by their attendance		
<u>Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #5</u> will be addressed several times in required AIM courses as shown in Table 1. Presentations, technical reports and essays will be evaluated against a specific rubric	**Spring 2015**	Evaluated in several AIM course but not everyone. Rubric and examples of presentations and/or writing works can be found Under Example Presentations and Example Writing	Included in this assessment review were AIM students at the junior and senior levels for technical writing and Sophomore level for writing	Expectations of proficiency is 80% or higher for all AIM Student Learning Outcomes	Based on the materials in review—most students 75 to 80 percent were efficient in completing works too an acceptable standard	Since faculty has agreed to adopt the same rubric for presentations and writing we determine it will be easier for students to follow the expectations of the program and become even more proficient	Based on a few student comments from Exit Survey—it will be discussed to implement more technical writing in lower level courses to gain a better understanding of the requirements

Comments on part I:

The results will be shared with the AIM faculty and others involved in AIM Assessment during the cycle year. Upon the evaluation of the SLO any changes or updates will be discussed and if necessary revision will be implemented to the AIM Assessment Plan.

II. Closing the Loo Information can be found in the folder under the "2018 Feedback" tab

Academic Assessment: Program Reviewed:___AIM____   **2018 Peer Feedback**

Thank you for submitting your **2017-2018** assessment report. Continual improvement in achieving student learning outcomes in each program through "closing the loop" is our goal. Please contact me if you would like to discuss this feedback report or to identify further assistance needed for your program's assessment process. I will be scheduling a meeting with you and your program faculty in fall semester to discuss assessment planning and program improvement.

As you may recall, the CSU-Pueblo process for reviewing assessment reports included a review session in June, during which deans, department chairs, directors, and faculty involved in assessment read the assessment reports and reviewed the current assessment plans for each program and then, using the rubric below, provided feedback for the program faculty to consider as they makes plans for improvements to assessment in the upcoming academic year. The following is the feedback from those peer reviewers:

	Reviewer #	Yes	No	Partially	Unclear	Comments
1. Were the student learning outcomes in **Column A** assessed according to the assessment plan? (Please refer to the assessment plan included on website.)	1	x				
	2	x				
2. Does **Column B** describe the date(s) on or during which the outcome was last assessed?	1	x				Do you normally wait 5 years between evaluations for SLO 6? **Years of SLO #6 assessment 2013, 2017**
	2	x				
3. Does **Column C** have an appropriate assessment measure? It should include a direct (e.g., exams, papers, portfolios) or an indirect measure (e.g., surveys), but should not include grades.	1	x				
	2	x				
4. If a rubric was used in the assessment process, is it attached or available in the plan?	1		x			The assessment plan cites rubrics for both SLOs evaluated, but I couldn't

Question	#					Comments
						find them **See attachment below labeled RUBRIC**
	2	x				
5. Does **Column D** describe the students or group of students involved in the assessment process?	1	x				
	2	x				
6. Does **Column E** describe the percentage of students the department expects to perform at a given level (e.g., 80 percent of students assessed will perform at the "meets expectation" and "exceeds expectation" level).	1			x		SLO 4 seemed in good shape. Response rates for surveys aren't a good measure for expected achievement. It would be better to have a % satisfaction on the survey or something. **AIM expectation is 82% or higher**
	2	x				
7. From the information provided in **columns F, G, and H**, do you believe that the department has genuinely engaged in a meaningful assessment process to improve teaching and learning?	1	x				I would have liked to see more discussion about the results – especially from the employer satisfaction surveys. The two questions included do not get to quality at all. **See below EMPLOYERS**
	2			x		Unclear how the department addresses student performance and employer expectations. **See**

						Student Performance below
8. In **columns F, G, and H**, does the department comment on actual student performance on the assessment instrument/process compared to the level it expected (the target level) in Column E? In other words, does the department discuss whether students performed at, below, or above the level the department expected?	1	x				
	2	x				
9. Does the department describe in **Column H** planned improvements in teaching and learning (e.g., pedagogy, curriculum) based on the assessment data and process?	1	x				What is being done is not 100% clear, but there appears to be a plan to address identified areas.
	2			x		Re: SLO 6—Department cites the employers survey as "more effective than last results," but no discussion of how the department or program have improved teaching and learning. **See Employers below**
10. In Part II, is at least one data-informed change to the curriculum or pedagogy included in this "close the loop" reporting? This would be attempts to improve the achievement of SLOs, beyond changes to the assessment instrument or process.	1				x	If you changed lectures and experiences in the previous year and then tested in Spring 2018, shouldn't you know if any progress was made? Or are you saying that you won't know the results of your changes until 2019? **Results will be included in the 2019 Assessment**
	2			x		The Student Exit survey is the part that most relates to this question. What efforts is the department

						making to achieve greater participation in both the student survey and the employer survey? **See EXIT below**
11. Are previous cycles of assessment data and planning referenced in reporting faculty efforts for continual improvement?	1	x			x	The department does reference information from when the SLOs were last assessed, but some of the timelines are confusing. I'm not sure what happened when.
	2	x				

12. Please comment on Part II of the report:
1. Requiring students to complete the exit survey as a programmatic element is smart. I hope you implement that next year. The focus on survey response rates is okay, but a much more meaningful measure would include the degree to which the employers are satisfied with the graduates they do hire/interview.
2. Good evaluation of the limitations of the outcomes, with reasonable discussion of how to improve participation in surveys. It may be a good idea to develop some specific strategies to increase the response rate in surveys, especially since they're integral to the assessment report

13. Please comment on the strengths of the report and the assessment plan overall:
1. The Assessment Plan is mostly complete and well intentioned. It seems to cover important aspects of the program.
2. This report clearly identifies the SLOs and methods used to evaluate those SLOs. The plan is a manageable one, with a reasonable focus on a few SLOs each year, instead of examining all outcomes each year.

14. Please make constructive recommendations for improvement:

1. The writing in the plan and report can be cleaned up to help with clarity. Please include any rubrics used. Date at top of report (and maybe other places?) was not correct.

2. The changes made by the department in Section 2 are more reflective of the tools used than the way information is taught. Be clearer about the ways the department teaches, and how that improves students' critical thinking and employment-seeking behavior.

RUBRIC: To ensure consistency in teaching and student learning outcomes all AIM faculty has adopted the below rubric

	4. Distinguished	3. Proficient	2. Apprentice	1. Novice
Oral Presentation- Enthusiasm: Energetic, not frenetic	Appeared enthusiastic about presentation at all times. Moderated level of excitement to hold audience's attention.	Appeared enthusiastic for most of the presentation. May have appeared overly enthusiastic at times. Held audience interest for most of presentation.	Showed some excitement about the topic. Attempted to modify behavior to engage audience on one or more occasions. Lost attention of some audience members.	Showed little or no enthusiasm about the topic. Did not moderate level of excitement in response to audience reaction. Lost audience interest.
Oral Presentation- Audience: Engage and interact with audience	Moderated speaking style based on audience feedback. Calmly and eloquently addressed audience questions and comments. Engaged audience for the duration of the presentation.	Adjusted volume, pace, and enthusiasm several times. Answered audience questions and addressed comments. Presenter adjusted enthusiasm or pace to hold audience attention.	Spoke more loudly when requested by audience members. Presenter was clearly uncomfortable. Presenter attempted to adjust enthusiasm or pace to hold audience attention.	Did not adjust speaking style based on audience reaction. Could not answer audience questions. Presenter made no visible effort to hold audience interest.
Oral Presentation- Pace: Speaks at an appropriate pace	Speaker adjusted pace to stay within allotted time. Speaker answered audience questions without running overtime or covered additional material if there were no questions.	Presentation was close to specified length. Speaker's pace was appropriate throughout.	Tended to speak too quickly or too slowly. Presentation ran a little long or was a bit too short.	Consistently spoke too fast or too slow. Presentation was much longer or shorter than specified length.

	4. Distinguished	3. Proficient	2. Apprentice	1. Novice
Oral Presentation-Content: Relates to topic, detailed, and accurate	All content directly related to the topic. Content was thoroughly developed and demonstrated detailed knowledge of the topic. Opinions were supported by fact wherever possible.	Content directly related to the topic. Included many details that demonstrated knowledge of the topic. Most opinions were supported by facts.	Had difficulty explaining how the content and topic relate. Many opinions were not factually supported.	Presentation did not relate to topic. Included few details and relied heavily upon unsupported opinion.
Oral Presentation-Knowledge: Demonstrate knowledge of subject	Demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the subject matter. Able to use audience questions to further demonstrate understanding of the topic. Appeared to be an expert on the subject being presented.	Demonstrated a working knowledge of the subject matter. Able to satisfactorily answer audience questions and provided additional information upon request.	Demonstrated a basic knowledge of the subject matter. Able to address audience questions by repeating parts of the presentation – did not provide any additional information.	Demonstrated little or no knowledge of the subject. Unable to answer audience questions or comment further on any part of the presentation.
Oral Presentation-Stays on Topic: Relevant to the topic	Entire presentation focused on the topic. Able to answer audience questions without straying from subject.	Majority of presentation was on-topic. Made effort to return to topic when presentation or audience questions strayed.	Some material was unrelated to the topic, or presenter used unrelated material to pad the presentation.	More than half of the presentation did not directly address the topic.
Oral Presentation-Posture/Eye Contact: Appropriate posture and effective eye contact	Stood upright and appeared confident throughout. Avoided rocking, shifting, and other nervous behavior. Made eye contact throughout the audience.	Posture was good for most of the presentation. Made eye contact numerous times during presentation. Did not rely too heavily on notes or visual aids.	Sometimes rocked, shifted, or appeared uncomfortable. Made occasional eye contact with one or two audience members. Did not rely too heavily on notes or visual aids.	Posture was poor. Slouched, shifted from foot to foot, and appeared very uncomfortable. Made almost no eye contact with the audience. Looked down or at notes or visual aids.

Presentations (100 points, 25% of grade);

Student is required to deliver five (5) presentations; four individual and one group. Each presentation is assigned 20 points. Presentation is evaluated by instructor and peers. Subject matter is as follows

- Self, personal background and career goals
- Idea/Concept
- Product
- Service or Product Training
-

Presentation is evaluated by the following rubric (rubric attached)

The rubric contains seven evaluation categories with each category weighed on a 1-4 scale. Since each presentation is assigned 20 points the 1-4 scale is translated to a five point base as follows;

1; Novice = 5 points

2; Apprentice = 10 points

3; Proficient = 15 points

4; Distinguished = 20 points

The seven categories are averaged resulting in the overall points awarded for each presentation. It is the program expectation for presentations to average 15 points thereby attaining a minimum of 75 total points for the course. Seventy five (75) points based on the one hundred (100) total points places the letter grade for this course requirement at C+, or approximately 5% greater than a letter grade of C which is the minimum grade necessary for AIM degree requirements.

Employers: Administration of Employer surveys will be reviewed and coordinated along with the Career Center. Each employ that visits on campus will be contacted within two days of visit and interviews hoping a response time and number will increase

Student performance is measures through teaching and participation in Cengage active learning. A very strong emphasis is placed on the Student ASE Testing which is done every year to evaluate technical skills and critical thinking

EXIT: Student exit survey will be given in SP19 for all 2019 Gradates. This test will be administered by the faculty administrative assistant to allow for anonymity. Results will be collected and tallies provide to AIM faculty. AIM students also participated in the CAT (Critical Analysis Testing) in April 2019