

**Ferris State University**  
**College of Engineering Technology**  
**Automotive Department**

**Academic Program Review**  
**Follow up Report**  
**for**  
**Automotive Engineering Technology**  
**& Automotive Service Technology**

**August 14, 2015**

**Prepared by:**

**Ben Upham, Director**

**School of Automotive & Heavy Equipment**

The following document was developed for the Academic Program Review committee to fulfill their request for a follow up report. The bold headings are areas of concern the committee requested be addressed.

**The current status regarding the effectiveness of the administrative structure providing direction and oversight.**

The Automotive department went through a change in leadership in the summer of 2012. At that time Dean Yates appointed Larry Schult as the interim director of the School of Automotive & Heavy Equipment and Ben Upham was asked to serve as the coordinator for the Automotive Service and Automotive Engineering Technology programs. Early in the spring of 2013 Dean Yates appointed Larry Schult as the Associate Dean and moved him into the Dean's office. This left the School of Automotive & Heavy Equipment without a director. Debbie Dawson filled in for a short time and then Ben Upham was elected as the director late in the spring of 2014 and has served as the director since then. Larry Schult was selected as the Dean of the College of Engineering Technology in the winter of 2013.

From the time Ben Upham was elected as the director until the summer of 2015 there was no one in the coordinator's position. This meant that the coordinator's responsibilities were being carried out by the director. During the summer of 2015 Dean Schult appointed William Wagner to the coordinator position on a part-time basis. William was assigned half of the coordinator's duties in addition to his reduced teaching load. His responsibilities in the coordinator role are: duties related to admissions, budget, curriculum and industry.

In the past three years the Automotive department has seen some significant changes in facilities and personnel. During Dean Yates tenure the faculty were asked to vacate their offices (cubicles) to allow for renovations of the space into more secure and private offices. Faculty obliged by moving into several different spaces throughout the automotive building.

Unfortunately the project never gained traction and the vacated space, for the most part, remained empty until the end of fall semester 2014. As can be imagined and understood this caused confusion amongst students as to where to find their professors or advisors and was not received well by the faculty.

After the personnel changes in the dean's office a new initiative was started to remodel the south wing of the automotive center including remodeling of the lobby entrance and front office,

creation of new faculty offices and a new lab for the testing of fuels and lubricants as well as adding air conditioning to two labs and a classroom. Funding was provided from the Vice President of Academic Affairs' (VPAA) office and the renovations are projected to be completed by the start of fall 2015 semester. The budget for these renovations was set at 1.5 million dollars.

The personnel changes that have occurred in the automotive department since the last Academic Program Review report consist of one retirement, one resignation and one transfer of faculty bargaining groups. The two vacated positions were posted in the fall of 2014 and the search process started. It was a yearlong process which resulted in the hiring of two tenure track faculty who will be teaching in the Automotive Service Technology program with possible assignments in the Automotive Engineering Technology program.

### **Updated program goals and timeline to completion.**

After reviewing input by both students and faculty via the attached surveys it is clear that there are a few things the department should concentrate on and set as goals to work towards in the next 1 – 5 years.

1. Facility enhancements
2. Tool and equipment upgrades
3. Increase donations from industry
4. Enhanced promotion of the AET program to industry
5. Increase internship opportunities with emphasis on international students
6. Enhance the curriculum review process to include a review cycle
7. Increase communication with students to address issues as they arise

### **Current student evaluation regarding program operations and quality.**

Two multi part questions on the student survey most closely address the above topic. These are question 4a – 4e Advising Experience and question 6a – 6e Facilities & Equipment.

Based on the 21 student responses to the survey the majority of students have had a relatively positive experience with advising (q4a – q4e). This isn't to say that there isn't room for improvement particularly in the area of 'graduation requirements' (q4c), 'information for decision making' (q4d), and 'other sources of information' (q4e).

In the area of facilities and equipment (q6a – q6e) students didn't have as positive an experience with a majority of students selecting "Somewhat Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree" with the five statements. This is why number 1 and 2 above need to become goals that are achieved in the next 1 to 5 years.

Work to upgrade facilities and equipment has already begun with the building improvements and acquisition of emission testing equipment. Approximately 33% of the students completing this survey would likely have had class in the old fuels & lube lab which is approximately 600 square feet in size. The new lab will be approximately 2200 square feet with enhanced ventilation, exhaust system and air conditioning. The automotive department also received one-time equipment money to purchase new emissions test equipment and Perkins funds to purchase scan tools in the combined amount of \$50,000.00. While this is a considerable amount of money it represents a fraction of the amount needed to make a significant difference in the overall equipment needs of the program. This is why donations from industry are so vital to the program and appear in the list of goals above.

General Motors and Ford have donated a total of 11 new or slightly used vehicles in the last three years for students to work with. These range in technology level from 2009 Pontiac G6 to a 2013 Cadillac Escalade and 2015 Explorer. There have also been several donations of transmissions, engines, and miscellaneous components by General Motors, Ford, Toyota, and Volkswagen.

### **Current student evaluation regarding curriculum effectiveness and relevancy.**

Two multi-part questions on the student survey most closely address the above topic. These are questions 3a – 3e ‘Quality of Instruction’ and questions 5a – 5e ‘Curriculum’.

Again based on the 21 student responses to the survey the majority of students have had a relatively positive experience with the quality of instruction (q3a – q3e).

According to the students responses to questions concerning curriculum (5a – 5e) the majority of the students answered their experience was relatively positive.

The students also had an opportunity to provide feedback on what improvements they would suggest be made to improve the program and several revolve around facilities and equipment, some around curriculum, and even a few around faculty. The facilities, equipment, and curriculum topics appear in the goal section above and should be addressed through that process.

### **Current faculty evaluation regarding program operations and quality.**

Faculty teaching in the AET and AUSV programs were surveyed and out of the seven surveys sent out four were returned. The surveys and responses are attached to this document for review.

Faculty were asked to provide their opinions of the program and their level of agreement with certain statements and give feedback to six open ended statements. The categories included: Goals & Objectives, Processes, Resources, and Statements.

The majority of the responses were positive however questions concerning instructional equipment and budgets were below the average. Please see attached survey report for individual responses.

### **Current faculty goals for currency within the field and timeline for completion.**

Please see question 9 of the attached faculty survey.

### **Update on curricular changes and success.**

The Automotive department has had three curriculum proposals move through the curriculum process since the last Academic Program Review. Two were curriculum clean up proposals and one was a request for an experimental course.

One of the curriculum proposals involved removing AUTO 250 from the AUSV check sheet due to low enrollment in that course and in its place students are allowed to take AUTO 200 twice for credit. This eliminated much confusion and low productivity issues.

Another of the curriculum proposals was a minor curriculum clean up that increased class sizes to the typical 30 student lecture section in AUTO 310, AUTO 320, and AUTO 480.

The third proposal was for the creation of an experimental class in "Forced Induction". This course was developed in response to suggestions made by the AET advisory committee. This class will run for the second and last time as an experimental course fall of 2015. It has had enrollment numbers of 18/30 fall 2014 semester and 21/30 fall 2015 semester. It is unclear at this point if the class will be utilized in the AET degree, as part of a certificate or discontinued.

## 15 AET APR Current Students Frequencies

**Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 06/15**

### Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	
	Valid	Missing			
q1 Grade level	21	0	4.71	5.00	
q2_1 Informed: Friend	21	0	.10	.00	
q2_2 Informed: Co-worker	21	0	.00	.00	
q2_3 Informed: High school counselor/teacher	21	0	.38	.00	
q2_4 Informed: FSU tour	21	0	.10	.00	
q2_5 Informed: Internet	21	0	.43	.00	
q2_6 Informed: Career Day	21	0	.00	.00	
q2_7 Informed: FSU student/graduate	21	0	.24	.00	
q2_8 Informed: Billboard or other advertisement	21	0	.00	.00	
q2_9 Informed: Other	21	0	.05	.00	
q2a Other Specified	21	0			
q3a The overall quality of classroom instruction was excellent.	21	0	2.95	3.00	
q3b My instructors' demeanor was kind, courteous and helpful.	21	0	3.24	3.00	
q3c The instructors overall mastery of subject matter was appropriate.	21	0	3.33	3.00	

q3d The instructors were regularly available for assistance.	21	0	3.38	4.00	
q3e The instructors exhibited professionalism in and out of class.	21	0	3.43	3.00	
q4a My advisor was knowledgeable about the General Education requirements.	21	0	3.14	3.00	
q4b My advisor was knowledgeable about the Major/Technical related requirements.	21	0	3.24	4.00	
q4c My advisor kept me current with what I needed for graduation.	21	0	2.86	3.00	
q4d My advisor provided the information I needed to make decisions.	21	0	3.00	3.00	
q4e My advisor was able to refer me to other sources of information.	21	0	2.95	3.00	
q5a The quality of the material presented in classes was adequate.	21	0	2.90	3.00	
q5b The material was presented at an appropriate pace.	21	0	3.05	3.00	
q5c The instructional media utilized in class enhanced my learning.	21	0	3.10	3.00	
q5d The difficulty of the material was appropriate for the level of the course.	21	0	2.95	3.00	
q5e The Major and/or Technical Related courses were very relevant to my intended career.	21	0	3.05	3.00	
q6a The classroom conditions were conducive to learning.	21	0	2.76	3.00	
q6b The AET/AUSV program has adequate facilities and equipment.	21	0	1.95	2.00	
q6c The equipment and tools are kept operational and well maintained.	21	0	2.05	2.00	
q6d The equipment is current with modern technology.	21	0	1.95	2.00	

q6e There was adequate availability of tools and equipment.	21	0	2.33	2.00	
q7 3 strengths of teh AET/AUSV program	21	0			
q8 3 improvements would recommend	21	0			
q9 Additional comments	21	0			

### Statistics

	Std. Deviation
q1 Grade level	1.309
q2_1 Informed: Friend	.301
q2_2 Informed: Co-worker	.000
q2_3 Informed: High school counselor/teacher	.498
q2_4 Informed: FSU tour	.301
q2_5 Informed: Internet	.507
q2_6 Informed: Career Day	.000
q2_7 Informed: FSU student/graduate	.436
q2_8 Informed: Billboard or other advertisement	.000
q2_9 Informed: Other	.218
q2a Other Specified	
q3a The overall quality of classroom instruction was excellent.	.590
q3b My instructors' demeanor was kind, courteous and helpful.	.625
q3c The instructors overall mastery of subject matter was appropriate.	.730
q3d The instructors were regularly available for assistance.	.740
q3e The instructors exhibited professionalism in and out of class.	.598
q4a My advisor was knowledgeable about the General Education requirements.	.964



q4b My advisor was knowledgeable about the Major/Technical related requirements.	.889
q4c My advisor kept me current with what I needed for graduation.	1.276
q4d My advisor provided the information I needed to make decisions.	1.095
q4e My advisor was able to refer me to other sources of information.	1.161
q5a The quality of the material presented in classes was adequate.	.831
q5b The material was presented at an appropriate pace.	.669
q5c The instructional media utilized in class enhanced my learning.	.625
q5d The difficulty of the material was appropriate for the level of the course.	.805
q5e The Major and/or Technical Related courses were very relevant to my intended career.	.921
q6a The classroom conditions were conducive to learning.	.944
q6b The AET/AUSV program has adequate facilities and equipment.	.865
q6c The equipment and tools are kept operational and well maintained.	.921
q6d The equipment is current with modern technology.	.973
q6e There was adequate availability of tools and equipment.	1.065
q7 3 strengths of teh AET/AUSV program	
q8 3 improvements would recommend	
q9 Additional comments	

## Frequency Table

q1 Grade level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	AET Freshman	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
	Auto Service Technology Sophomore	2	9.5	9.5	19.0
	AET Sophomore	3	14.3	14.3	33.3
	AET Junior	7	33.3	33.3	66.7
	AET Senior	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_1 Informed: Friend**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	19	90.5	90.5	90.5
	Selected	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_2 Informed: Co-worker**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	21	100.0	100.0	100.0

**q2\_3 Informed: High school counselor/teacher**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	Selected	8	38.1	38.1	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_4 Informed: FSU tour**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	19	90.5	90.5	90.5
	Selected	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_5 Informed: Internet**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	12	57.1	57.1	57.1
	Selected	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_6 Informed: Career Day**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	21	100.0	100.0	100.0

**q2\_7 Informed: FSU student/graduate**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	16	76.2	76.2	76.2
	Selected	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2\_8 Informed: Billboard or other advertisement**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	21	100.0	100.0	100.0

**q2\_9 Informed: Other**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not Selected	20	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Selected	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q2a Other Specified**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		20	95.2	95.2	95.2
	Parents	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q3a The overall quality of classroom instruction was excellent.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
	Somewhat Agree	14	66.7	66.7	85.7
	Strongly Agree	3	14.3	14.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q3b My instructors' demeanor was kind, courteous and helpful.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
	Somewhat Agree	12	57.1	57.1	66.7
	Strongly Agree	7	33.3	33.3	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q3c The instructors overall mastery of subject matter was appropriate.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	8	38.1	38.1	52.4
	Strongly Agree	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q3d The instructors were regularly available for assistance.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	7	33.3	33.3	47.6
	Strongly Agree	11	52.4	52.4	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q3e The instructors exhibited professionalism in and out of class.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Somewhat Agree	10	47.6	47.6	52.4

	Strongly Agree	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q4a My advisor was knowledgeable about the General Education requirements.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Somewhat Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	5	23.8	23.8	52.4
	Strongly Agree	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q4b My advisor was knowledgeable about the Major/Technical related requirements.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	4	19.0	19.0	47.6
	Strongly Agree	11	52.4	52.4	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q4c My advisor kept me current with what I needed for graduation.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Somewhat Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	38.1
	Somewhat Agree	3	14.3	14.3	52.4
	Strongly Agree	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q4d My advisor provided the information I needed to make decisions.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	6	28.6	28.6	57.1
	Strongly Agree	9	42.9	42.9	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q4e My advisor was able to refer me to other sources of information.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	38.1
	Somewhat Agree	3	14.3	14.3	52.4



	Strongly Agree	10	47.6	47.6	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q5a The quality of the material presented in classes was adequate.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Somewhat Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	10	47.6	47.6	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q5b The material was presented at an appropriate pace.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	4	19.0	19.0	19.0
	Somewhat Agree	12	57.1	57.1	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q5c The instructional media utilized in class enhanced my learning.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Somewhat Disagree	3	14.3	14.3	14.3
	Somewhat Agree	13	61.9	61.9	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q5d The difficulty of the material was appropriate for the level of the course.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Somewhat Disagree	4	19.0	19.0	23.8
	Somewhat Agree	11	52.4	52.4	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q5e The Major and/or Technical Related courses were very relevant to my intended career.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	4.8	4.8	4.8
	Somewhat Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	28.6
	Somewhat Agree	7	33.3	33.3	61.9
	Strongly Agree	8	38.1	38.1	100.0

	Total	21	100.0	100.0	
--	-------	----	-------	-------	--

**q6a The classroom conditions were conducive to learning.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	2	9.5	9.5	9.5
	Somewhat Disagree	6	28.6	28.6	38.1
	Somewhat Agree	8	38.1	38.1	76.2
	Strongly Agree	5	23.8	23.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q6b The AET/AUSV program has adequate facilities and equipment.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	7	33.3	33.3	33.3
	Somewhat Disagree	9	42.9	42.9	76.2
	Somewhat Agree	4	19.0	19.0	95.2
	Strongly Agree	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q6c The equipment and tools are kept operational and well maintained.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	6	28.6	28.6	28.6
	Somewhat Disagree	10	47.6	47.6	76.2
	Somewhat Agree	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
	Strongly Agree	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q6d The equipment is current with modern technology.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	8	38.1	38.1	38.1
	Somewhat Disagree	8	38.1	38.1	76.2
	Somewhat Agree	3	14.3	14.3	90.5
	Strongly Agree	2	9.5	9.5	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q6e There was adequate availability of tools and equipment.**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	5	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Somewhat Disagree	8	38.1	38.1	61.9
	Somewhat Agree	4	19.0	19.0	81.0

	Strongly Agree	4	19.0	19.0	100.0
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q7 3 strengths of teh AET/AUSV program**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Valid		8	38.1	38.1
	1. Combination of hands on work and operational theory 2. Helpful faculty 3. "Close" to the East Coast.	1	4.8	4.8
	Hands on work is great!	1	4.8	4.8
	Hands on, involved, and well spaced out	1	4.8	4.8
	Helpful teachers who are willing to work with students, classes are laid out in a chronological order, lots of automotive knowledge amongst the staff.	1	4.8	4.8
	how the program is setup the ability to move from AUSV to AET easily or vice versa job assistance	1	4.8	4.8
	Knowledge, time, and teachers help	1	4.8	4.8
	LACK OF RECOGNITION WORLDWIDE, NOT ENOUGH JOBS, NOT ENOUGH OPTIONS FOR PROFESSORS FOR EACH CLASS. SORRY NEEDED MORE SPACE FOR NEGATIVE COMMENTS.	1	4.8	4.8
	Most members of the staff are very helpful in every way possible.	1	4.8	4.8
	Nice teachers, helpful teachers, fun environment	1	4.8	4.8
	Professor Billings The chassis dyno SAE racing clubs	1	4.8	4.8
	The faculty members are true professionals and experts in their field of study.	1	4.8	4.8

	There are many good qualities I'm mostly concerned about the areas that need improvement	1	4.8	4.8	
	Unique major with a broad spectrum of learning. One of few programs tailored to automotive engineering. Many employers look for AET students at career fairs.	1	4.8	4.8	
	Total	21	100.0	100.0	

**q7 3 strengths of teh AET/AUSV program**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid		38.1
	1. Combination of hands on work and operational theory 2. Helpful faculty 3. "Close" to the East Coast.	42.9
	Hands on work is great!	47.6
	Hands on, involved, and well spaced out	52.4
	Helpful teachers who are willing to work with students, classes are laid out in a chronological order, lots of automotive knowledge amongst the staff.	57.1
	how the program is setup the ability to move from AUSV to AET easily or vice versa job assistance	61.9
	Knowledge, time, and teachers help	66.7
	LACK OF RECOGNITION WORLDWIDE, NOT ENOUGH JOBS, NOT ENOUGH OPTIONS FOR PROFESSORS FOR EACH CLASS. SORRY NEEDED MORE SPACE FOR NEGATIVE COMMENTS.	71.4
	Most members of the staff are very helpful in every way possible.	76.2
	Nice teachers, helpful teachers, fun environment	81.0
	Professor Billings The chassis dyno SAE racing clubs	85.7
	The faculty members are true professionals and experts in their field of study.	90.5

	There are many good qualities I'm mostly concerned about the areas that need improvement	95.2
	Unique major with a broad spectrum of learning. One of few programs tailored to automotive engineering. Many employers look for AET students at career fairs.	100.0
	Total	

**q8 3 improvements would recommend**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		7	33.3	33.3	33.3
	1 making companies aware about the AET program and what it's about 2 the advisors need to be more aware of what to do. My advisor does nothing for me I am a transfer student so I am off course and I feel like I have to do the work to figure the classes I need to graduate then I show it to my advisor. The only thing that personal does for me is remove my hold so I can register. They need to be more involved and aware of what classes need to be completed 3 the building and technology is outdated we are learning on vehicles of the past that are almost out dated. I have a friend that works at a GM dealership and he says the material we learn is obsolete compared to the level of work they do on a daily basic	1	4.8	4.8	38.1

<p>1. AET needs more design from a mathematical standpoint. How can we be engineers if we do not even know how to calculate suspension angles for a golf-cart?</p> <p>2. More flexible scheduling. Certain classes are only offered at certain times and they often conflict with each other; I have to do an extra semester because of the poor availability of classes. Maybe add some evening classes or once-a-week classes.</p> <p>3. Get rid of Service Floor for AET. We are in an ENGINEERING program, not a service program. Us AET students are earning our BS because we DO NOT want to work in a shop, so why do we? And on that note, why do we have to buy tools if we are not going to work in a shop after graduation?</p>	1	4.8	4.8	42.9
<p>COMPLETELY RE-DO THE SERVICE FLOOR. The equipment is old and only worked half of the time. The grading scale benefitted kids who didn't know what they were doing, when other who cared and actually worked got worse grades. CHANGE THE WHOLE CLASS</p>	1	4.8	4.8	47.6
<p>Cover more information in class Get newer equipment</p> <p>Allow students to substitute service floor</p>	1	4.8	4.8	52.4
<p>Get a new machine shop/fix current machines, add at least one performance oriented class to the curriculum, refresh service floor with more modern equipment.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	57.1
<p>Get rid of bad teachers like professor Wagner</p>	1	4.8	4.8	61.9
<p>More coinsiding with ASE. newer equipment. A hybrids class</p>	1	4.8	4.8	66.7
<p>More lab time</p>	1	4.8	4.8	71.4
<p>Need newer teachers, needed new equipment, focus money for program more on students/ equipment rather than how the building looks...</p>	1	4.8	4.8	76.2
<p>Need to update the equipment such as gas benches, scan tools, more alternative fuel vehicles.. Add forced induction to the program curriculum. Need to incorporate the use of the dyno in more courses.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	81.0



	<p>The curriculum taught in the classroom needs to keep better pace with the technological advancements being made in the automotive industry. The lack of audiovisual and computer based learning is quite frankly putting ferris at a disadvantage to other schools. Students need to understand the material in a way that gives them access to tools that are and will continue to be used and developed in industry. The program needs to update the cars they have students use for study so they can have a sense of the newer technologies that are becoming more and more available.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	85.7
	<p>The equipment other than the chassis dyno is extremely out of date or faulty. In most instances the equipment available did not work properly if even at all. Much of the equipment available is out of date and not up to industry standards with the exception of scan tools. Some examples of this includes the gas analyzers for emissions and many of the machines used in the engine machining classes. Another weakness is the curriculum. I feel as if I did not learn any new information from either the emissions or alternative fuel classes. They seemed to be repeats of earlier classes. Along with the content of the courses themselves there was also not enough modern technology available for us to interact with in order to familiarize ourselves with the systems we will be coming in contact with once we graduate.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	90.5
	<p>Updated equipment, maybe remove some older things that aren't used or are broken and replace or repair them. Especially in the Engine Performance Machining lab.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	95.2
	<p>WAIVE THE INTERN CLASS THAT HAS PUT NOTHING BUT OBSTACLES IN OUR PROGRAM, FIRE THE GREEDY UNHELPFUL MR. UPHAM, FIND A REPLACEMENT FOR MR. WAGNER THE STILL ASSISTANT PROFESSOR AFTER 40 YEARS, AND ACTUALLY CARE ABOUT THE STUDENTS FUTURE AFTER THEY GRADUATE.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	<p>Total</p>	21	100.0	100.0	

**q9 Additional comments**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		13	61.9	61.9	61.9
	<p>1 My biggest frustration is the fact that AET students are required to have every tool on the tool list for one semester and after that semester most of us with rarely use them again because we be in engineering positions we as service students will need them as soon as they get a job. It is not logical to have that added expense. Another option would be to allow AET students and service students to team up and share their tools instead of each student being required to have to exacta same tools. Some students like my self are putting our selves through school without help from parents etc and the expends of say 10,000 in tools is a major obstacle 2 i do not see why we have to pay the credit hours for our internships because the university does not have any expense into the student getting and internship, there is no need to pay a professor so why do we have to pay for our internships besides it being another way for the university to get more money. 3 The program's needs to have a hands on diagnosis class that specifically focuses of operation scan tools</p>	1	4.8	4.8	66.7

	<p>All the core automotive classes should be brought up to the same level of difficulty as Mr. Wagner's engine class. Student's should be able to use work experience to opt out of service floor. Service floor should be less credit hours. Every class needs to have the hands-on labs updated. Newer equipment, need to actual work on new stuff not just read about it.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	71.4
	<p>I am really disappointed with the AET program. I was under the impression that I was going to learn about automotive service as well as automotive design, but the "design" part was scarcely there. I took more manufacturing courses than design courses, and I feel like I did not get the education that I wanted. I barely learned any mathematical calculations for design in the Automotive courses, and I really feel handicapped for my future position. I learned nothing about foreign manufacturers in any of my service classes, and the facilities are ill-equipped. I would most likely not go back to the AET program at Ferris, and I do not promote the program.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	76.2
	<p>I love going to school here and this program makes me love learning.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	81.0
	<p>Keep Todd Ballard around.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	85.7

	<p>Overall I am extremely dissatisfied with how this program is run and the content that is taught. It is evident that the program is sub par when professors from other programs that teach courses that fall under the course requirements essentially mock the program. There have been multiple professors that have expressed this. I would also like to show my distraught with the fact that the front office was completely remodeled but yet there is not any money to fix equipment that is essential for my education and to allow me to thrive once I am out in industry working. This is extremely unnerving to me and along with the fore mentioned makes me feel like I have wasted money on this program. A recommendation that I would make would be to create a course that involves programming and operation of the PCM of the vehicle since this is the main component of the modern automobile and can not operate without it.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	90.5
	<p>WAIVE THE INTERN CLASS BECAUSE THE AET IS JUST NOW GETTING RECOGNITION, THE HIRING RATE OF THE CAREER FAIRS ARE A JOKE, AND PEOPLE ARE GETTING SCAMMED OUT OF THEIR HARD EARNED MONEY BY NOT GETTING A DEGREE BECAUSE JOBS ARE NOT AVAILABLE AND MR. UPHAM SEEMS ONLY TO CARE ABOUT HOW MUCH MONEY HE CAN TAKE OUT OF OUR POCKETS.</p>	1	4.8	4.8	95.2
	<p>Will not recommend program to others</p>	1	4.8	4.8	100.0
	<p>Total</p>	21	100.0	100.0	

## 15 AET/AUSV APR Faculty Frequencies

**Prepared by: Institutional Research & Testing, 08/15**

### Statistics

	N		Mean	Median	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing			
q1a Participation in development of College Occupation Prog plan	4	0	4.00	4.50	2.160
q1b Program goals	4	0	5.00	5.00	.000
q1c Course objectives	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q1d Competency based performance objectives	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q1e Use of competency based performance objectives	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q1f Use of information on labor market needs	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q1g Use of information on job performance requirements	4	0	4.25	5.00	2.217
q1h Use of professionalindustry standards	4	0	4.25	5.00	2.217
q1i Use of student followup information	4	0	5.25	5.00	.500
q2a Adaptation of instruction	4	0	4.25	5.00	2.217
q2b Relevance of supportive courses	4	0	4.75	5.00	.500
q2c Coordination with other community agencies & edu programs	4	0	3.50	4.00	1.732
q2d Provision for work experience, co-op ed, clinical experience	4	0	4.75	5.00	1.258
q2e Program availability and accessibility	4	0	5.00	5.00	.816

q2f Provision for the disadvantaged	4	0	4.25	4.50	.957
q2g Provision for the handicapped	4	0	4.25	4.50	.957
q2h Efforts to achieve sex equity	4	0	4.25	4.50	.957
q2i Provision for program advisement	4	0	4.50	5.00	1.000
q2j Provision for career planning & guidance	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q2k Adequacy of career planning & guidance	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q2l Provision for employability information	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q2m Placement effectiveness for students in this prog	4	0	4.25	5.00	1.500
q2n Student followup system	4	0	3.50	4.00	1.732
q2o Promotion of this occupational program	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q3a Provision for leadership & coordination	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q3b Qualification of administrators &/or supervisors	4	0	4.25	5.00	2.217
q3c Instructional staffing	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q3d Qualifications of instructional staff	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q3e Professional development opportunities	4	0	4.75	5.00	.500
q3f Use of instructional support staff	4	0	4.25	4.00	.500
q3g Use of clerical support staff	4	0	4.00	5.00	2.000
q3h Adequacy & availability of instructional equipment	4	0	3.00	3.00	1.633
q3i Maintenance & safety of instructional equipment	4	0	4.50	4.50	.577
q3j Adequacy of instructional facilities	4	0	4.00	4.00	.816
q3k Scheduling of instructional facilities	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q3l Adequacy & availability of materials & supplies	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q3m Adequacy & availability of learning resources	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q3n Use of advisory committees	4	0	3.75	4.50	1.893
q3o Adequacy of current operating budget	4	0	1.75	1.50	.957

q3p Budget provisions in capital outlay budget for equipmt	4	0	1.75	1.50	.957
q4a Current, state of the industry equipment is used in instruction	4	0	3.00	3.00	.000
q4b Adequate funds are in place for replacement of outdated equipmt	4	0	1.75	2.00	.500
q4c A dedicated classroom would benefit the AET prog & increase visibility	4	0	2.75	3.00	1.258
q4d The potential for prog growth would increase w/ an increase in resources	4	0	4.00	4.00	.000
q4e The program resources are adequate to compete w/ similar progs at other schools	4	0	2.00	2.00	.816
q5 Strengths of the AET/AUSV program(s)	4	0			
q6 Areas that need improvement in the AET/AUSV program(s)	4	0			
q7 Recommended changes to AET/AUVS program(s)	4	0			
q8 Current status regarding the the effectiveness of the administrative structure providing direction & oversight	4	0			
q9 Goals for currency w/in the field & timeline for completion	4	0			
q10 Additional comments	4	0			

## Frequency Table

**q1a Participation in development of College Occupation Prog plan**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1b Program goals**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Excellent	4	100.0	100.0	100.0

**q1c Course objectives**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0



	Total	4	100.0	100.0	
--	-------	---	-------	-------	--

**q1d Competency based performance objectives**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1e Use of competency based performance objectives**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1f Use of information on labor market needs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0

	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1g Use of information on job performance requirements**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1h Use of professional industry standards**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q1i Use of student followup information**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2a Adaptation of instruction**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2b Relevance of supportive courses**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2c Coordination with other community agencies & edu programs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2d Provision for work experience, co-op ed, clinical experience**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2e Program availability and accessibility**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2f Provision for the disadvantaged**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2g Provision for the handicapped**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2h Efforts to achieve sex equity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2i Provision for program advisement**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2j Provision for career planning & guidance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2k Adequacy of career planning & guidance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2l Provision for employability information**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2m Placement effectiveness for students in this prog**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Below Expectations	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2n Student followup system**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q2o Promotion of this occupational program**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3a Provision for leadership & coordination**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3b Qualification of administrators &/or supervisors**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Don't Know	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	



**q3c Instructional staffing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3d Qualifications of instructional staff**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3e Professional development opportunities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3f Use of instructional support staff**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	3	75.0	75.0	75.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3g Use of clerical support staff**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Excellent	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3h Adequacy & availability of instructional equipment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Acceptable	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3i Maintenance & safety of instructional equipment**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Good	2	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3j Adequacy of instructional facilities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Excellent	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3k Scheduling of instructional facilities**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3l Adequacy & availability of materials & supplies**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3m Adequacy & availability of learning resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0
	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3n Use of advisory committees**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Good	1	25.0	25.0	50.0

	Excellent	2	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3o Adequacy of current operating budget**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	2	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Below Expectations	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q3p Budget provisions in capital outlay budget for equipmt**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Poor	2	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Below Expectations	1	25.0	25.0	75.0
	Acceptable	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q4a Current, state of the industry equipment is used in instruction**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	---------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Somewhat Agree	4	100.0	100.0	100.0
-------	----------------	---	-------	-------	-------

**q4b Adequate funds are in place for replacement of outdated equipmt**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat Disagree	3	75.0	75.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q4c A dedicated classroom would benefit the AET prog & increase visibility**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat Agree	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Strongly Agree	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q4d The potential for prog growth would increase w/ an increase in resources**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	4	100.0	100.0	100.0

**q4e The program resources are adequate to compete w/ similar progs at other schools**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Disagree	1	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Somewhat Disagree	2	50.0	50.0	75.0
	Somewhat Agree	1	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q5 Strengths of the AET/AUSV program(s)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	AET had exceptional placement, outstanding entry-level salaries, impressive growth, and incredible acceptance in the Automotive Industry.	1	25.0	25.0	
	AET has Auto Service as its base, the mechanical ability the students develop before taking engineering classes is critical to the strength and success of the program.	1	25.0	25.0	
	AET provides the grads with an excellent career path. Wages are very good and advancement is likely. It provides our grads with an excellent opening into the automotive industry.	1	25.0	25.0	
	Student placement, current technology taught, many instructors to convey different material adequately.	1	25.0	25.0	
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q5 Strengths of the AET/AUSV program(s)**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid	AET had exceptional placement, outstanding entry-level salaries, impressive growth, and incredible acceptance in the Automotive Industry.	25.0
	AET has Auto Service as its base, the mechanical ability the students develop before taking engineering classes is critical to the strength and success of the program.	50.0
	AET provides the grads with an excellent career path. Wages are very good and advancement is likely. It provides our grads with an excellent opening into the automotive industry.	75.0
	Student placement, current technology taught, many instructors to convey different material adequately.	100.0
	Total	

**q6 Areas that need improvement in the AET/AUSV program(s)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid		2	50.0	50.0	



	<p>Current administration has been extremely detrimental to the continuance of AET's success. On several occasions, administration has defied, blatantly, the recommendations and participation of the faculty who have been responsible for the success of the program. This is evidenced in the decline in enrollment in the program, something that has never happened before. The three faculty members who have previous employment experience in engineering have been precluded from the recruiting process. A process that is very weak at best. The AET program has been denied participation in engineering grants and studies because of the background and education of the faculty. Instead of correcting this with new hires, Administration at the School and College level recently hired two new faculty members whose backgrounds are even weaker, against the specific recommendations of the faculty. Curriculum recommendations, agreed upon by a substantial majority of the faculty, have been refused by the administration. Due to a total lack of course and program assessment, our ABET accreditation is in jeopardy. This saddens me beyond words.</p>	1	25.0	25.0	
	<p>We need more current vehicles and additional funds to keep pace with current technology.</p>	1	25.0	25.0	
	<p>Total</p>	4	100.0	100.0	

**q6 Areas that need improvement in the AET/AUSV program(s)**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid		50.0

	<p>Current administration has been extremely detrimental to the continuance of AET's success. On several occasions, administration has defied, blatantly, the recommendations and participation of the faculty who have been responsible for the success of the program. This is evidenced in the decline in enrollment in the program, something that has never happened before. The three faculty members who have previous employment experience in engineering have been precluded from the recruiting process. A process that is very weak at best. The AET program has been denied participation in engineering grants and studies because of the background and education of the faculty. Instead of correcting this with new hires, Administration at the School and College level recently hired two new faculty members whose backgrounds are even weaker, against the specific recommendations of the faculty. Curriculum recommendations, agreed upon by a substantial majority of the faculty, have been refused by the administration. Due to a total lack of course and program assessment, our ABET accreditation is in jeopardy. This saddens me beyond words.</p>	75.0
	<p>We need more current vehicles and additional funds to keep pace with current technology.</p>	100.0
	<p>Total</p>	

**q7 Recommended changes to AET/AUVS program(s)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid		1	25.0	25.0	

Return existing administration to the Auto Service classroom. Restore operations to a professional, pro-active environment wherein the strengths of the faculty are recognized and utilized. Instead of approaching faculty approved curriculum proposals with the statement: "Well, we'll see about that", form a committee to develop the recommendations into a working curriculum and incorporate these improvements. Stop squelching open discussion behind the falsehood of "intimidation" and allow the faculty to have open, productive discussions. This tactic is currently being employed to allow the minority to manipulate the program, as they wish, and has had severe, negative impacts. Unless these changes are made, that which was once the preeminent program in our college, will continue its decline to failure.	1	25.0	25.0	
The most needful change in these programs is the removal of a faction within the department which is very negative and contrary to the success and growth of the programs.	1	25.0	25.0	
Try to get more manufactures involved in our programs so we could coordinate the use of their equipment to enhance our course offerings.	1	25.0	25.0	
Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q7 Recommended changes to AET/AUVS program(s)**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid		25.0

	Return existing administration to the Auto Service classroom. Restore operations to a professional, pro-active environment wherein the strengths of the faculty are recognized and utilized. Instead of approaching faculty approved curriculum proposals with the statement: "Well, we'll see about that", form a committee to develop the recommendations into a working curriculum and incorporate these improvements. Stop squelching open discussion behind the falsehood of "intimidation" and allow the faculty to have open, productive discussions. This tactic is currently being employed to allow the minority to manipulate the program, as they wish, and has had severe, negative impacts. Unless these changes are made, that which was once the preeminent program in our college, will continue its decline to failure.	50.0
	The most needful change in these programs is the removal of a faction within the department which is very negative and contrary to the success and growth of the programs.	75.0
	Try to get more manufactures involved in our programs so we could coordinate the use of their equipment to enhance our course offerings.	100.0
	Total	

**q8 Current status regarding the the effectiveness of the administrative structure providing direction & oversight**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid	Administratively the general oversight is good.	1	25.0	25.0	
	The administrative structure is adequate at this time.	1	25.0	25.0	
	The change in the director of the school of Automotive and Heavy Equipment was very needful and will be of great benefit to the programs. Support from the dean's office and VPA seems to be good.	1	25.0	25.0	

	Totally non-existent. The Dean is the least effective the College has had in decades. There is no direction. There is no effective structure. There is no oversight. There are no plans. If the Dean is 'in the belly of the beast', it's time for the beast to vomit. Admin is so ineffective & clueless, no one is willing to serve as Prog Coord.	1	25.0	25.0	
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q8 Current status regarding the the effectiveness of the administrative structure providing direction & oversight**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administratively the general oversight is good.	25.0
	The administrative structure is adequate at this time.	50.0
	The change in the director of the school of Automotive and Heavy Equipment was very needful and will be of great benefit to the programs. Support from the dean's office and VPA seems to be good.	75.0
	Totally non-existent. The Dean is the least effective the College has had in decades. There is no direction. There is no effective structure. There is no oversight. There are no plans. If the Dean is 'in the belly of the beast', it's time for the beast to vomit. Admin is so ineffective & clueless, no one is willing to serve as Prog Coord.	100.0
	Total	

**q9 Goals for currency w/in the field & timeline for completion**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid		1	25.0	25.0	

Goals include the following: Try to restore corporate programs such as GM ASEP, FORD ASSET, and Chrysler CAP programs within the next year. Try to enhance our relationships with industry to encourage more donations of vehicles and equipment w/in the next yr.	1	25.0	25.0	
Participate in a minimum of 20 hours of update training- Annually Update classes currently taught to include 15 weeks robust of online content- by 2017 Replace key pieces of equipment with updated models- by 2017 Add Certifications in areas that would benefit students-by 2016.	1	25.0	25.0	
Really? Complete courses, attend seminars, as required. This question is an example of the ineptitude of Administration.	1	25.0	25.0	
Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q9 Goals for currency w/in the field & timeline for completion**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid		25.0
	Goals include the following: Try to restore corporate programs such as GM ASEP, FORD ASSET, and Chrysler CAP programs within the next year. Try to enhance our relationships with industry to encourage more donations of vehicles and equipment w/in the next yr.	50.0
	Participate in a minimum of 20 hours of update training- Annually Update classes currently taught to include 15 weeks robust of online content- by 2017 Replace key pieces of equipment with updated models- by 2017 Add Certifications in areas that would benefit students-by 2016.	75.0
	Really? Complete courses, attend seminars, as required. This question is an example of the ineptitude of Administration.	100.0
	Total	

**q10 Additional comments**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Valid		3	75.0	75.0	
	I would hope that my comments and the comments of others would serve to restore what was once the preeminent program in the College. However, recent practices undertaken by Admin & faculty minority leave substantial doubt that AET can be saved from its current decline to failure. Sad, very sad.	1	25.0	25.0	
	Total	4	100.0	100.0	

**q10 Additional comments**

		Cumulative Percent
Valid		75.0
	I would hope that my comments and the comments of others would serve to restore what was once the preeminent program in the College. However, recent practices undertaken by Admin & faculty minority leave substantial doubt that AET can be saved from its current decline to failure. Sad, very sad.	100.0
	Total	

