Refrigeration & Air Conditioning Technology
Honolulu Community College
Fall 2008 Annual Assessment Report
Covering the Fall 2007-Spring 2008 Semesters

College Mission Statement
Honolulu Community College's mission is to:
1. 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.
2. 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 Refrigeration & Air Conditioning 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 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

Fall of Year	2005	2006	2007
Annual New and Replacement Positions State	C/P	33 / 58	32
Annual New and Replacement Positions County	C/P	7 / 42	24
Number Majors	69	73	70
SSH for Program Majors all Program Classes	575	594	506
SSH for non program majors in all program classes	10	0	12
SSH for all students in all program classes	585	594	518
FTE Program Enrollment	39.00	39.60	34.53
Number of Classes Taught	5	5	3
Average Class Size	23.40	17.20	15.00
Class Fill Rate	97.50	58.90	45.92
FTE (headcount) of BOR Appointed Program Faculty	2.0	2.0	2.0
Student/ Faculty Ratio (calculated field)	34.5	36.5	35.0
Number of Majors Per FTE (workload) Faculty	41.32	39.04	41.92
Program Budget Allocation	C/P	$163,739	C/P
Cost Per SSH (Calculated field)	C/P	$276	C/P
Number of classes that Enroll less than 10 students	0	1	1
Persistence Fall to Spring	84.06	75.34	78.57
Number of Degrees Earned	13	20	13
Number Certificates Earned	1	2	0
Number of Students Transferred	1	0	1
Perkins Core Indicator - 1P1	76.47	75.00	77.27
Perkins Core Indicator - 1P2	84.21	88.89	95.83
Perkins Core Indicator - 2P1	63.16	66.67	54.17
Perkins Core Indicator - 3P1	75.00	75.00	88.89
Perkins Core Indicator - 3P2	88.89	100.00	100.00
Perkins Core Indicator - 4P1	1.69	0.00	0.00
Perkins Core Indicator - 4P2	0.00	0.00	0.00

Part II: Analysis of the Program

- *List the names of your instructional faculty who taught in the Fall 2007 / Spring 2008 semesters.*
    1. Associate Professor,CC, Derek Oshiro
    2. Associate Professor,CC, Allen Tateishi

- *List the names of your instructional lecturers who taught in the Fall 2007 / Spring 2008 semesters.*
    1. None

- *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).*

- *What are the strengths of this program?*
    1. The instructors form the core of the HCC RAC Program. The new curriculum enhances the program in that it gives instructors the flexibility to mold the class time to be relevant to the subject matter. In the past, lecture and lab was fixed to an hourly schedule and did not have the flexibility for the instructor to extend the lecture time to explain an important point, or to allow more time in lab so students could complete an important project.

- *What are the weaknesses of this program?*
    1. An ongoing problem is the lack of space. The fact that everything is shared between the first and second year classes make it difficult to set up lab projects that span multiple days because of shared use of   the lab. Having only one classroom also creates a bottleneck because the first and second year class times overlap by a couple of hours, so the morning class has to vacate the classroom before the afternoon class begins. There are no known weaknesses in the RAC Program curriculum.

- *What opportunities exist for the program?*
    1. The HCC RAC Program is a very stable and consistently excellent program. There are many opportunities to expand this program, but unless the facilities are expanded, it would be counterproductive to look into expanding this program.

- *What challenges (threats) exist for the program?*
    1. Other than budget cuts, the RAC program is healthy and has very little competition. One point of concern is that both full time instructors are nearing retirement age and since the RAC program does not have any lecturers, there is no pool of instructors prepared to step in should there be a need.

- *Are the measurement of your Program and Course SLOs providing adequate information to evaluate student learning or should new measures be developed?*
    1. Program and Course SLOs are adequate.

- *How do you know that students are achieving your stated Program SLOs?*
    1. Feedback from students and employers. The RAC dept. sees many of its former students through visits and because most of them attend nighttime apprenticeship

classes on campus, we get to see and talk to many of them. Employers also call or stop by to let us know what is good about a graduate/worker and what could be improved.

- *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.)*
    1. Throughout the 2 year program, students are tested by written tests, performance tests, required projects, and observation by the instructors, to make sure they meet the SLOs.

- *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?*
    1. Other than limited facilities, the program has sufficient resources to promote student learning.

- *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?*
    1. Both instructors include course SLOs in their syllabus.

- *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?)*
    1. The department develops their own SLOs and maintains them within the department. The HCC website lists the course SLOs, and the division secretary has a copy.

- *Are all safety issues addressed?*
    1. General safety is covered at the beginning of the semester and specific safety issues are covered as needed. An example of covering a safety issue as needed, would be; when demonstrating tools, or a procedure that could be dangerous.

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)?*
    1. As stated in the previous action plan, the HCC RAC program is now an official Student Branch of the American Society of Heating Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Engineers. The department has upgraded the classroom by purchasing new tables for the classroom and new tables and chairs for the department's computer lab. New updated software was purchased to replace outdated software.

- *What tasks/goals have you set for the upcoming year (Fall 2008 / Spring 2009)?*
    1. With the implementation of the new curriculum, no new major improvements are envisioned for the near future. Other than minor tweaking and steady improvements, the HCC RAC program is very stable and does not need major

upgrading or changes.

- *Who will be responsible for completing these tasks/goals?*
    1. *E*veryone in the department will be responsible for improving the department (both instructors).

- *What is the timeline for achieving these tasks/goals?*
    1. There is no timeline as this is an ongoing goal.

Part IV: Resource Implications (physical, human, financial)
- *Are there any budgetary impacts for carrying out your action plan?*
    1. No

- *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?)*
    1. No

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.*
    1. No