# SUMMARY OF DEBRIEFING MEETING FORM

*The Summary of Debriefing Meeting Form must be completed and signed concluding the on-site evaluation.*
==A signed copy must be left with the institution and provided to the ASE Education Foundation.==

**Institution Name:**  **Pima Community College - Automotive**

**Date and time of meeting:**  **11/18/2020 - 4:00**

Please outline details of the meeting. Include information on program strengths and standards that need improvement.

**Program strengths:**

Overall strength; program is completely arranged so students open-entery and exit to meet individual needs. Each station incorporates ASE tasks as part of a larger process that allows students to prove competency at their own pace. Extensive staff assistance provided for the faculty and for individual student instruction. Each work station equipped with tools, equipment, test, and diagnostic equipment needed for learning every aspect of the task. Following are rated 5. 7.1-A; excellent simple course listing & brochure. 7.6-A; simple time card specific to each class with listing of required stations. 7.7-C; all stations required hands-on testing. 8.8-A; exceptional ease of tool access. 9.2-B; more than adequate fire extinguishers. 9.4-A; exceptional cleanliness throughout the facility. 9.7-E; each work station are locked and secured when not in use. 9.9-A; extensive availlablilty of exhaust hoses with heat shields.

3,000 character limit

1/1/2017

**Standards that need improvement (provide standard number - example 7.1A):**

6.1-A; rated "No" - more than half the meetings over the last 5 years have less than 5 industry members in attendance, although this met standards in 2020. 6.1-C; rated 3 - advisory committee may benefit from greater number of technicians, especially former students. 6.2-A; rated 3 - need to share actual operating budget categories and amounts with the advisory committee on an annual basis. 6.5-A; rated 3 - need to involve the committee in an overall annual program evaluation. 6.5-C; rated 3 - need to develop actual process to review and update tools, equipment and training aides. 6.3-C; rated "No" - need some type of facilities checklist that is used by the advisory committee for annual evaluation. 7.5-D; rated 3 - it would be beneficial for the students to record flat-rate time for each task/station. 7/14-E; rated 2 - need to develop student follow-up data that is used in the evaluation process. 7.15-D; rated 3 - Repair Orders are being used but need to be "industry-type" rather than education type. 9.2-A; rated 3 - some storage areas with gases need external signage. 9.2-C; rated 3 - central electrical disconnect needs visible signage. 9.2-E; rated 3 - safety inspections are being held by facilities, but need to be routinely shared with the faculty. 9.10-C - first aide kit has expired ointment. 10.3-B - One faculty instructor doesn't meet the 20 hours per year of technical updating requirement.

3,000 character limit

# AUTOMOBILE SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET
## (Standards 6-11)

**\*\*USING THE EVALUATION GUIDE RATING SHEETS EVALUATE THE PROGRAM BASED ON THE LEVEL OF ACCREDITATION APPROVED FOR TEAM REVIEW. \*\***

ACCREDITATION ☐          RENEWAL OF ACCREDITATION ☒

a.  Number of program hours in the course of study: <u>1488</u>
    Minimum hour requirements:  **MLR – 540**      **AST – 840**      **MAST - 1200**

b.  Is this program using Standard 11 (Work-Based Learning) to meet hour requirements?

    YES ☐  NO ☒          If so, how many hours? _____

c.  Is this program using Standard 12 (E-Learning) to meet hour requirements?

    YES ☐  NO ☒          If so, how many hours? _____

d.  Percentage of:  P-1:          %  P-2:          %  P-3:          %

e.  Does the instructor(s) meet the minimum qualifications?          Yes ☒ No ☐

f.  Does the instructor(s) have current **ASE A6 & G1** certification?          Yes ☒ No ☐

   *FOR MLR ACCREDITATION ONLY*
g.  Does the instructor(s) have current **ASE A4, A5, A6, & G1** certification?

    YES ☐  NO ☐

   *FOR MAST ACCREDITATION ONLY*
h.  Does the **Engine Performance** instructor(s) hold current ASE certification in Advanced Engine Performance L-1?

    YES ☒  NO ☐

i.  *Is the instructor(s) an ASE Master Certified Technician?*          *Yes* ☒ *No* ☐

# AUTOMOBILE SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET
## (Standards 6-11)

**\*\* USING THE PROGRAM EVALUATION RATING SHEETS FOR STANDARDS 6-10 EVALUATE THE PROGRAM BASED ON THE LEVEL OF ACCREDITATION APPROVED FOR TEAM REVIEW. \*\***

## STANDARDS

|  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |  | If applicable |
| **Number of evaluators** | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |
| **AVERAGE MLR** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **AVERAGE AST** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **AVERAGE MAST** | 3.3 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 4.1 | 4.0 |  |

## Strengths/Recommendations for Improvements (give Standard number)

Strengths: following are rated 5. 7.1-A; excellent simple course listing & brochure. 7.6-A; simple time card specific to each class with listing of required stations. 7.7-C; all stations required hands-on testing. 8.8-A; exceptional ease of tool access. 9.2-B; more than adequate fire extinguishers. 9.4-A; exceptional cleanliness throughout the facility. 9.7-E; each work station are locked and secured when not in use. Recommendations for Improvements: see page 16.

# SUMMARY OF DEBRIEFING MEETING FORM (cont.)

**The following recommendations must be addressed and documented at the next on-site evaluation. (The disposition of recommendations listed here will be addressed at the next on-site evaluation as part of the continuous improvement process.)**

For advisory meetings to meet the 2 times per year requirment, each meeting must have at least 5 members from industry present. Advisory meeting minutes need to reflect graduate results data is shared with the committee and the committee completes a facilities inspection at least annually. Related to this, Standard 7.14-E requires the use of follow-up data in the evaluation process.

*[handwritten: 20 HRS - Roman submit]*

2,500 character limit

**Signatures below verify the program's strengths and weaknesses were verbally shared with the program administrator and program instructor concluding the on-site visit, and that a copy of this form has been provided to the institution for their records.**

| # | Signature | Typed or Printed Name | Date (m/d/yyyy) |
|---|-----------|----------------------|-----------------|
| 1. | Program Administrator Signature | Greg Wilson | 11/18/2020 |
| 2. | Program Instructor Signature | Skylar Webb | 11/18/2020 |
| 3. | Team Member Signature | Paul Herrick | 11/18/2020 |
| 4. | Team Member Signature | Bryant Horn | 11/28/2020 |
| 5. | Team Member Signature | | |
| 6. | Team Member Signature | | |
| 7. | ETL Signature | Gerald M. Petersen | 11/18/2020 |

**The following recommendations must be addressed and documented at the next on-site evaluation. (The disposition of recommendations listed here will be addressed at the next on-site evaluation as part of the continuous improvement process.)**

For advisory meetings to meet the 2 times per year requirement, each meeting must have at least 2 members from industry present. Advisory meeting minutes need to reflect candidate results data as shared with the committee and the committee completes a facilities inspection at least annually. Related to this Standard 7.14-F requires the use of follow-up data in the evaluation process.

**Signatures below verify the program's strengths and weaknesses were verbally shared with the program administrator and program instructor concerning the on-site visit, and that a copy of this form has been provided to the institution for their records.**

| | Typed or Printed Name | Date (mm/dd/yyyy) |
|---|---|---|
| Program Administrator Signature | Greg Wilson | 11/18/2020 |
| Program Instructor Signature | Skylar Webb | 11/18/2020 |
| Team Member Signature | Paul Hartley | 11/18/2020 |
| Team Member Signature | Duane Hunt | 11/28/2020 |
| Team Member Signature | | |
| Team Member Signature | | |
| ED. Signature | Gerald M. Peterson | 11/18/2020 |