College Mission Statement
Honolulu Community College’s mission is to:
• Serve the community as an affordable, flexible, learning centered, open-door comprehensive Community College that meets the post-secondary educational needs of individuals, businesses, and the community.
• Serve the Pacific Rim as the primary technical training center in areas such as transportation, information technology, education, communications, construction, and public and personal services.

Program Mission Statement
The Automotive Technology program’s mission is to serve the community as a learning-centered, open door program that provides technical training to meet the demands of the automotive industry and the needs of the individual. An open-exit option allows the students to identify their career objectives and participate in program exploration.

Part I: Quantitative Indicators for Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall of Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual New and Replacement Positions State</td>
<td>C/P</td>
<td>-74 / 545</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual New and Replacement Positions County</td>
<td>C/P</td>
<td>-205 / 367</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Majors</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for Program Majors all Program Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>904</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for non program majors in all program classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for all students in all program classes</td>
<td></td>
<td>909</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Program Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes Taught</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Fill Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.02</td>
<td>57.46</td>
<td>55.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE (headcount) of BOR Appointed Program Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ Faculty Ratio (calculated field)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors Per FTE (workload) Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Allocation</td>
<td>C/P</td>
<td>$576,241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per SSH (Calculated field)</td>
<td>C/P</td>
<td>$603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes that Enroll less than 10 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Fall to Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>68.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Certificates Earned</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Transferred</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 1P1</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 1P2</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II: Analysis of the Program

- List the names of your instructional faculty who taught in the Fall 2007 / Spring 2008 semesters.
  - Spring 2007: Clifford Yamashiro, Craig Ohta, Paul Allen, Noel Alarcon, Gordon Talbo, Ivan Nitta, Duane Ozaki, Roy Nagamine
  - Fall 2008: Spring 2007: Clifford Yamashiro, Craig Ohta, Paul Allen, Noel Alarcon, Gordon Talbo, Ivan Nitta,

- List the names of your instructional lecturers who taught in the Fall 2007 / Spring 2008 semesters.
  - Spring 2007: Noel Alarcon, Duane Ozaki, Roy Nagamine
  - Fall 2008: Noel Alarcon,

- List the names of any non-instructional (support) faculty or staff in your program for the Fall 2007 / Spring 2008 semesters (if not applicable, just skip).
  - Fall 2007: David Medeiros
  - Spring 2008: David Medeiros

- What are the strengths of this program?
  - We train students who are serious in becoming a professional automotive technicians and not as a hobby shop-like program. Therefore, our program is nationally certified (NATEF.)
    - Students get curriculum and task assignments that are pertinent to the real world
    - Certification also requires that all instructors to obtain and remain currentcy with their ASE certifications. Complete a specific amount of training hours each year and teach on modern vehicles using the latest equipment, testers and techniques.

- What are the weaknesses of this program?
  - Money! To keep our program up-to-par with the requirements of national certification along with the expectations of our local industry, money is always a concern.
  - Secondarily, our instructors find it very hard to leave their class during the course of a semester to take training classes, when available, on the latest technology found in new vehicle designs. Often, we find that our physical location (Hawaiian Islands) is a hindrance for travel to various training facilities on the mainland.
    - Substitute lectures, which are qualified to teach our courses (ASE certified) and have the time to take off their full-time employment are very hard to find and this adds to the problems of keeping AMT instructors current with technology.

- What opportunities exist for the program?
  - Building partnerships with vehicle manufacturers and creating satellite training at our location.

- What challenges (threats) exist for the program?
  - Loss of funding would threaten our stature as a premier training program.
  - Loss of instructional positions (through attrition) would cause a severe problem to the quality of instructions.

- Are the measurement of your Program and Course SLOs providing adequate information to evaluate student learning or should new measures be developed?
Yes! Our course outcomes are designed by NATEF and are accepted by the nation as desirable SLO’s or outcomes.

How do you know that students are achieving your stated Program SLOs?

- Through various measuring tools. I.e.: pre knowledge surveys, post knowledge surveys, task assignments and worksheets, chapter reviews, course quizzes and examinations, practical exams and cooperative education evaluation.

What kinds of evidence can you provide? (You don’t have to include the evidence in this report. Just list some of the ways that you collect evidence on student learning. Examples include knowledge surveys, projects, writing samples, observations, portfolios, performance tests, capstone experiences, etc.)

- Same as above

Does the program have sufficient resources to promote student learning? Are other resources needed such as personnel, facilities, or equipment? If additional resources are required, what evidence/rationale is there to support this?

Do all of your instructors (both faculty and lecturers) include the course (not program) SLOs into their syllabus? How do you ensure that everyone is doing so?

- No. However, all NATEF tasks (SLOs) and their priority numbers (order of importance) are listed on the program’s web site. Students can access this information at any time and from any place.

Where do the instructors get the course SLOs from? (Do they get them from the program coordinator? From the division secretary? From the HCC Website?)

- Each instructor receives a copy of the latest task list directly from NATEF every 3-5 years and must up-date his or her books and course materials as necessary. The program must be reviewed every 2.5 years and then become re-certified every 5 years.

Are all safety issues addressed?

- Yes

Part III: Action Plan

What tasks/goals have you accomplished from your previous action plan items on last year’s annual review report (include any strategic planning items that were funded / not funded – if not funded, where was your item prioritized on the strategic plan)?

- Funded: (1) Scan tool, (1) tire machine, (1) on-car brake lathe, (1) multimedia projector, (1) Elmo projector
- Not Funded: Vacant retired instructor position (not sure of the priority but it was in our plan)

What tasks/goals have you set for the upcoming year (Fall 2008 / Spring 2009)?

- Manufacturer partnership conversation/agreements (pending current economy), new equipment or better equipment, more training, fill vacant instructional and support staff positions

Who will be responsible for completing these tasks/goals?

- Program Dean, AMT department personnel, OE manufacturer and aftermarket organizations, Program funding

What is the timeline for achieving these tasks/goals?

- 1-3+ years

Part IV: Resource Implications (physical, human, financial)

Are there any budgetary impacts for carrying out your action plan?

- Yes, cost and personnel position/equipment

Do any of your action plan items require integration into the strategic plan? (If so, have you notified your division chair / Dean of this action?)

- Yes / Yes
Part V: Strategic Planning Items

- Does your program have any funding requests on the current strategic plan (equipment, positions, etc.)? If yes, please write an explanation on how your program review report supports the need to fund the program’s strategic plan request.
  
  o Yes. The position belongs to AMT and, as it stands, has not been filled. A second instructor has vacated his position by transferring to another school and a third has been recently removed for unknown reasons. All this leads to us being very short handed. We have noted students consistently expressing their frustrations and feel that they are being cheated by the college because adjunct instructors are temporary and not focused on the course. (The program is worried that students will go to another NATEF program in the state)