



Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program **TECHNOLOGY & AVIATION – Architecture/Drafting**

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and submitted to the Program Review Committee by the Division Chair.

Author: Dave Martin, Assistant Division Chair – Technology and Aviation
Division Chair: Scott Rubke
Date Received by Program Review: November 17, 2011

Overview of the Program

All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).

Statement of Purpose – briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The Architecture program has been designed to prepare students to enter the field of architecture. Both transfer students and students requiring training to enter the workforce as drafters/designers are served.

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review.

The most significant achievement is the development of new classes that teach the advanced and MEP (Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing) components of Autodesk Architectural Revit. This program is widely used in the Architecture and related fields. This training has been extremely helpful for students in the Glendale area to gain and maintain employment due to software changes in the industry.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. Four regular adjunct instructors that allow a wide variety of courses to be offered.
2. Adaptability of the department to offer current and relevant curriculum.
3. High level of student-oriented instruction that is designed to serve the student.

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Lack of certificates that do not reflect the current course offerings.
2. Lack of SLO assessment data.
3. Lack of a well-defined advisory board.

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Program	Academic Year	FTEs Trend	FTEF Trend	WSCH / FTEF Trend	Full-Time % Trend	Fill Rate Trend	Success Rate Trend	Awards Trend
Architecture & Drafting	2007-2008	55	3.0	576	48.0%	102.2%	79.1%	21
	2008-2009	64	3.9	524	52.0%	80.3%	73.7%	19
	2009-2010	78	4.2	598	31.0%	86.2%	76.1%	7
	2010-2011	65	4.2	485	36.9%	66.0%	65.1%	2
	% Change	+18.2%	+40.4%	-15.8%	-23.1%	-35.4%	-17.7%	-90.5%
	4-Yr. Trend	increasing	increasing	decreasing	decreasing	decreasing	decreasing	decreasing
Technology & Aviation Division TOTAL	2007-2008	532	37.5	451	38.1%	73.1%	74.3%	91
	2008-2009	591	37.2	505	30.9%	69.6%	74.9%	85
	2009-2010	757	45.4	530	32.7%	82.1%	74.4%	59
	2010-2011	675	44.7	480	33.7%	91.7%	76.1%	76
	% Change	+26.9%	+19.1%	+6.5%	-11.6%	+25.5%	+2.4%	-16.5%
	4-Yr. Trend	increasing	increasing	stable	decreasing	increasing	stable	decreasing

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning:

Full-time trend has been dropping due to the one full-time instructor taking on additional duties as assistant division chair. This has not affected students due to the increase in adjunct instruction.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

No.

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

List each Department within the Division as well each degree, certificate, or other program* within the Department	Active Courses with Identified SLOs		Active Courses Assessed		Course Sections Assessed		If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed? Yes or No
	n/n	%	n/n	%	n/n	%	
ARCH. & DRAFTING	14/14	100	0/14	0	0/14	0	No

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

Even though all active courses have SLOs, there have been no regular assessments of these classes. This may be due to the lack of time available to the adjunct instructors to assess the data. As for the classes that are taught by the full-time instructor, there is no excuse.

- 2.2. a) Please provide a **link*** to all program assessment timelines here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.
 b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.
 c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.

- a) There is no link to program assessment timelines.
 b) No courses have been changed due to alignment matrices.
 c) As stated previously, the only progress is the development of course SLOs.

- 2.3 a) Please provide a **link** to any program and/or relevant course assessment reports. Does the evidence from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?
 b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

- a) There is no link to course assessment reports.
 b) No courses have been changed due to assessment conducted.

- 2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year.
Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.

Arch 105 – Perspective Graphics, Arch 120 – Residential Architectural Design I, Arch 130 – Commercial Architectural Design I, Arch 252 - Introduction to Revit MEP & Structure

- 2.5 Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.

Four new certificates have been submitted for approval. They have not been submitted to LOWDL or to the Chancellor's Office.

- 2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

No changes only additional certificates have been created.

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

- 3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

Ongoing discussion with students (both current and former) regarding the course offerings. The three Revit courses are a direct result of this.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
Formation of an Advisory Board of industry professionals.	Development of curriculum that is relevant to industry needs.
Increased SLO assessments of current courses.	Better understanding of whether course goals are being met.

Format Rev. 8.31.11