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>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 -74 / 545</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual New and Replacement Positions County</td>
<td>C/P -205 / 367</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Majors</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for Program Majors all Program Classes</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for non program majors in all program classes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH for all students in all program classes</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE Program Enrollment</td>
<td>60.60</td>
<td>63.67</td>
<td>61.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Classes Taught</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Class Size</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Fill Rate</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>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/ Faculty Ratio (calculated field)</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>46.67</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>37.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Budget Allocation</td>
<td>C/P $576,241</td>
<td>$609,928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Per SSH (Calculated field)</td>
<td>C/P $603</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of classes that Enroll less than 10 students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence Fall to Spring</td>
<td>65.45</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td>68.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Earned</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Certificates Earned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students Transferred</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 1P1</td>
<td>65.28</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 1P2</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>97.44</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 2P1</td>
<td>39.19</td>
<td>56.41</td>
<td>45.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins Core Indicator - 3P1</td>
<td>93.75</td>
<td>86.21</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Attention: The 2008-2009 Perkins Core Indicators’ (all) indicate a zero numeric value. However, these calculations cannot be correct, and we would like clarification for them.**

### Part II: Analysis of the Program

**List the names of your instructional faculty who taught in the Fall 2008 / Spring 2009 semesters:**

- Paul Allen, Ivan Nita, Craig Ohta

1. **List the names of your instructional lecturers who taught in the Fall 2008 / Spring 2009 semesters:**

- Noel Alarcon, Kerweyne Paulo, Roy Nagamine, Clifford Yamashiro

1. **List the names of any non-instructional (support) faculty or staff in your program for the Fall 2008 / Spring 2009 semesters (if not applicable, just skip):**

- Kerweyne Paulo, David Medeiros, Justin Clute (Student support)

**What are the strengths of this program?**

- The AMT program’s focus is to train future technicians for a professional career in the automotive repair industry. Therefore, the strength of the program lies within its success and ability to maintain national certification from the national automotive technician educational foundation (NATEF).
  - HCC is the premier automotive training center in the state and have been certified first (one other program is currently certified) and has been teaching under specific guidelines the longest (currently over 16 years)
- This certification requires that the program utilize curriculum that follows tasks (student learning outcomes) that are determined by a panel of experts from the industry who understand its needs.
- AMT is proud of its faculty and staff who collectively have more than 160 years of experience. Many of who have been shop owners, shop foreman or lead technicians.
- As a result of the faculty’s experience in the automotive repair industry, many relationships have been forged throughout the state, which
What are the weaknesses of this program?
- Newer technologies, such as: electric, hybrid and alternated fuel vehicles, etc. are currently gaining popularity and becoming prevalent in the industry. Quality training institutions like ours must be able to keep pace with current technology found on American roads. Newer vehicle, testing equipment and instructor training are critical to the continued success of the program.

What opportunities exist for the program?
- To continue being a leader in entry-level automotive training throughout the State and expanding “In-service” training throughout the State and into the Pacific Rim.

What challenges (threats) exist for the program?
- Technology within the automotive repair industry is constantly changing. Therefore, the quantity of money the program works-with is a constant threat to its continued success. Several design evolutions have come to fruition in the past few years such as, electrical vehicles, hybrid vehicles, flex-fuel vehicles, etc. creating newer technology for our students to learn. Newer technologies require more training, new equipment, vehicles, etc all of which requires money and will eventually become a requirement by NATEF.
  - Obviously, reduced funding is a major threat. Increased expectations from NATEF requiring updated training, equipment, books and vehicles

Are the measurement of your Program and Course SLOs providing adequate information to evaluate student learning or should new measures be developed?
- Because utilizes an advisory board to determine the industries needs, both program and course SLO’s are indeed currently adequate to evaluate its students competencies.

How do you know that students are achieving your stated Program SLOs?
- Through knowledge point tests, exams and worksheet that reflect the SLO’s. Also, through practical testing. Finally, the program uses a “passport” that each student gets for each course in the program and the instructor grades the student on their ability to demonstrate course task competencies.
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.)

The AMT program uses: module exams, final written exam, final practical exam, pre and post knowledge surveys, task performance worksheets and oral consultation/exams

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?

- Does the program have sufficient resources? No.
- If additional resources are required, what evidence/rationale is there to support this?

Detailed Description:

There is (and has always been) constant concern regarding instructor training, up-date to modern tools, equipment and vehicles. However, the most pressing need is the ability for instructors to leave their class and attend training that are held around town or on the mainland. Several brainstorming efforts have taken place to address this issue but to no avail. Because it is extremely difficult for the department to obtain an ASE certified individual (NATEF requirement for substitutes) to sub a class, department has been requesting an additional 9-month, full-time faculty position for a Substitute Instructor/Fleet Vehicle Repair Technician so that as training becomes available, any instructor may leave his/her class at a given moment leading to one less reason (finding a substitute) that our instructors are not attending more training annually.

The evidence:

When it comes to NATEF recertification and the mid-point review, the program has always had a difficult time to meet the minimum required annual training of 20hr a year. During our last recertification (Spring 2009), it was mentioned to us (by the evaluation team leader [ETL]) that we are just meeting the minimum hours and that in some cases; the instructor’s training is not necessarily aligned with the courses they are teaching.

Hawaiian instructors are at the mercy of those trainings that eventually do come to town. Therefore, any training class that does eventually come to the school is often not the ideal specialty course that all instructors may need to keep his knowledge at the pinnacle of current times.

Another fact that has been learned over time can affect the way the instructor teaches his class is "specific vehicle" (vehicles that have specific items or controllers that another vehicle may not have). Vehicles are slowly becoming dilapidated more often than usual because many vehicle components and wiring are probed, removed, tested and handled over and over again. Wires, connections, components, mounting brackets, adjustments, etc. require constant repairs and long road tests to reset computer adaptations confirming that the vehicle is truly back to original operating condition (something students can’t do for liability reasons). Therefore, a instructor/technical assistance is
needed to help all courses repair and maintain program vehicle used in the program (reducing long term expenses).

This problem may seem to be the job of the instructors themselves. However, instructors are extremely busy with course content, program updates, task assignment, homework and student demands and often find that many necessary vehicles, needing attention, get pushed-back to a later date and slowly become dilapidated over time.

Many instructors’ earnestly try to perform these tasks, on weekends and during the evening hours, but this task can be very overwhelming. With the current loss of some full-time instructors, due to leave of absents and retirement, we continually fall further and further behind these issues. At some point this will affect our national certification standing. Currently, we are using several part-time lecturers who have other obligation other than teaching and, themselves, find it hard to assist in these matters.

Finally, our advisory committee (and NATEF ETL) has referenced this concern and has strongly recommended we get some faculty help other than the APT (a dedicated sub-instructor) to assist with the substitution. And, when not substituting, this position requires them to maintain shop vehicles along with creating mock-ups for the program.

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?

- Yes, this information is on line and is provided by NATEF @ www.natef.org. This same information is provided to each instructor and is posted in the facility’s main hallway for all students and visitors to see.
- Each instructor uses a list of tasks for his course (called a student passport). After each module or at the end of the course, the instructor grades the student on how well they have performed each task insuring that all SLO’s competencies are completed.

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?)

- NATEF’s home web-site (www.natef.org/automotivetask). These assignments are also found at HCC’s home web-site.

Are all safety issues addressed?

- Yes. Safety is a priority and the department does its best to insure all students are safe. Along with the course instructor, the department also assigns a “Safety Liaison” for the program whom attends safety class on a regular basis (once or twice each semester)
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:
- Established new ties with American Honda and AC Delco. However, the economic downturn has put many issues on hold for now.
- Purchased incidental tools and equipment.

Not Funded:
- Substitute Instructor/vehicle maintenance facilitator,
- Replacement equipment (always a high priority) for aging fleet.
  - Ignition analyzer, gas analyzer, scan tool up-dates, newer touch screen scan tools, alignment equipment, EPA approved engine parts cleaner and new safer gasoline buggies (remove and replace good and stale gas)
    - Priority 1-5 on strategic plan. However, this request will continually be made due to the clearing of priorities each semester.

What tasks/goals have you set for the upcoming year (Fall 2009 / Spring 2010)?
- Update the new NATEF tasks into our course SLO’s.
- Obtain a full time instructor position (sub/repair tech/mock-up)
- Send instructors for updated training (mainland manufacturers training)

Who will be responsible for completing these tasks/goals?
- Assessment committee, program instructors, administration.

What is the timeline for achieving these tasks/goals?
- ASAP. This question is currently hard to answer based on the current economic climate (especially for Hawaii)

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

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

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. Our Division Chair, Bert Shimabukuro has been informed and completely understands the need and severity.
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.

- Yes, Instructor training through the use of a full-time Substitute Substitute Instructor/Fleet Vehicle Repair Technician.
  - The program review supports the need to fund this request through the requirements of remaining nationally certified. A major hindrance and requirement for continued certification is the assurances that program instructors are properly (and currently) trained for the courses they are teaching. Isolation from the US mainland poses a continuous threat in keeping the instructors’ currently trained.
  - A case in point occurred for HCC this past spring semester (2009) when the certifying team leader (Michael Richards) made a comment to me about quality training.
  - I asked Mr. Richards whether Hawaii had a strong case to request that NATEF give consideration to Hawaii for its unique location that makes it difficult for its instructors to get “pertinent” training in their respected courses. His response was “No”. “National certification means National certification, period!”

- The other fund request is to change our $40,000.00 annual budget to read a “minimum” of $40,000.00 / annual. We are requesting this change because of costing increases for shop supplies, equipment upgrades, safety concerns and vehicle part replacements that was recommended by our advisory committee.