College of San Mateo

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW & PLANNING Form Approved 9/2/2008: Governing Council Revised: 2/14/2012

The Program Review process should serve as a mechanism for the assessment of performance that recognizes and acknowledges good performance and academic excellence, improves the quality of instruction and services, updates programs and services, and fosters self-renewal and self-study. Further, it should provide for the identification of weak performance and assist programs in achieving needed improvement. Finally, program review should be seen as a component of campus planning that will not only lead to better utilization of existing resources, but also lead to increased quality of instruction and service. A major function of program review should be to monitor and pursue the congruence between the goals and priorities of the college and the actual practices in the program or service.

~Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

INSTRUCTIONS

For information about cycles for *Comprehensive Program Review and Planning*, see Instructional and Student Services program review rotation schedules posted online in their respective sections of the program review webpage:

http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/program_review/program_review.php)

Resources for Supporting Documentation:

A listing of resources and documents which provide data or information for each section is included at the end of this document, after the final signature page. These resources are posted online and their URLs are listed at the end of this document.

(You may delete this section, when you submit your final program review.)

Next Steps:

Program Review and Planning reports are due March 25, 2012. This date is aligned with CSM's Integrated Planning Calendar. (See: <u>http://collegeofsanmateo.edu/prie/planning.asp</u>)

Upon its completion, please email this *Program Review and Planning* report to the Vice President of Instruction, the Vice President of Student Services, the appropriate division dean, the CSM Academic Senate President, and the Dean of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE).

James Carranza, Academic Senate President, <u>carranza@smccd.edu</u> Susan Estes, Vice President of Instruction, <u>estes@smccd.edu</u> Jennifer Hughes, Vice Prsident of Student Services, <u>hughesj@smccd.edu</u> John Sewart, Dean (PRIE), <u>sewart@smccd.edu</u>

DEPARTMENT OR PROGRAM: Architecture

DIVISION: Math/Science

I. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

People need places in which to live, work, play, learn, meet, govern, shop, and eat. *Architects*—licensed professionals trained in the art and science of building design—transform these needs into concepts and then develop the concepts into images and plans of buildings that can be constructed by others. The architect is usually the "conductor" of an "orchestra" of related environmental design professionals that includes structural, civil, mechanical, electrical, acoustic, and geotechnical engineers, landscape architects, waterproofing, specialized equipment and facilities consultants as well as interior and lighting designers. The architect synthesizes the needs of the client, the constraints of the site, budget, codes, and building technology with the focused and often disparate expertise of the project design team to create a new three dimensional and material "symphony" of form. This is the essence of the architect's design process -- creative problem solving that begins with the first client meeting or site visit and continues through construction to the location of the last piece of furniture.

College of San Mateo's architecture program prepares students to transfer to B.A. and B.Arch programs and to related environmental design majors. Although an A.S. degree is architecture is offered, the entry-level professional degree is the B.Arch (and, for students earning a B.A. degree, the M.Arch). The program also supports the campus as a whole through ARCH 100, a general education course. Graduates of the program have transferred to many schools of architecture, but especially to U.C. Berkeley's B.A. program in architecture and to the B.Arch programs at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and California College of the Arts. B.A. and B.Arch programs at public universities in California are highly impacted, restricting access for students who cannot afford a private college education. The architecture and related professions. The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects a 16% increase in the employment of architects over the 10 year period ending in 2018 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2010-11 Edition). CSM offers the only architecture transfer program in the district.

The architecture program was put on hiatus in 2003-4 following the retirement of the last remaining full-time faculty member and returned to active status with a revised curriculum and staffed by adjunct faculty in Fall 2007. Historically and upon its return, the program offered two full years of major courses, allowing students to transfer as juniors and complete the B.A. in two additional years or the B.Arch in three additional years. However, budget cuts combined with differences in the second year curriculum across transfer schools led to a reduction in second year offerings in 2008-9 and the elimination of second year offerings thereafter. In addition, starting in 2010-11, ARCH 100 was offered in the spring semester only. The second year courses were banked effective Fall 2011 and the A.S. major requirements have been modified to include first year courses along with a supplemental course in Art, Digital Media, or Drafting. The major preparation for transfer in architecture also includes advanced math (one or two semesters of calculus) and physics (one or two semesters of calculus-based or trig-based physics).

The program currently offers five architecture courses in support of the major and one additional course that supports the major as well as satisfying a CSU-GE requirement.

ARCH 666 is a 1 unit introduction to the field that provides an overview of the profession for students considering architecture as a career. ARCH 666 satisfies the AA/AS degree requirement for Career Exploration and Self Development and, together with ARCH 100, is part of the articulation to U.C. Berkeley's architecture major preparation.

ARCH 100 provides a survey of contemporary architecture. The course satisfies the CSU-GE Area C1 (arts) requirement and attracts students from a wide variety of majors. It is articulated with major preparation at Cal Poly SLO and U.C. Berkeley.

ARCH 120 and **ARCH 140** form a two semester sequence in drawing and design communication. These courses were modified effective Fall 2011 to reflect increased use of software tools in design. The sequence is articulated with major preparation at U.C. Berkeley and, together with the studio sequences, with major preparation at Cal Poly SLO.

ARCH 210 and **ARCH 220** form a two semester design studio sequence. Studio work is at the heart of architecture education; students in ARCH 210 and 220 not only learn course content but are also exposed to the learning style that they will see in core courses after transfer. The sequence is articulated with major preparation at U.C. Berkeley and, together with the drawing and design communication sequences, with major preparation at Cal Poly SLO.

Each architecture course is offered only once in an academic year; courses by term and prerequisite relations are shown below.

prerequisite →

prerequisite; may be taken concurrently>

Fall	<u>Spring</u>
ARCH 666 Introduction to Architecture (1)	ARCH 100 Survey of Modern Architecture (3)
ARCH 120 Architectural + Design Drawing I (2)	ARCH 140 Architectural + Design Drawing II (2)
♦ ARCH 210 Design I (4)	★ ARCH 220 Design I (4)

The reduced curriculum has worked reasonably well for the past two years. However, based on the First Year Curriculum conference held at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo in July 2011, there will be increased emphasis on portfolio evaluation in Cal Poly's transfer admissions. CSM students would benefit greatly from an opportunity to enhance their portfolios beyond the first year courses.

In addition to courses, the department supports an active Architecture Club, with George Sun as faculty advisor. The Architecture Club and other department activities provide students with experience in the profession beyond the classroom and support the program through community outreach. For the past three years, CSM architecture students have created temporary parks in downtown San Mateo as part of PARK(ing) Day, an annual, worldwide event in which metered parking spots are transformed into temporary parks. In 2010, CSM architecture students participated in the renovation of Floery's Books in Pacifica; the project won Wells Fargo's small business storefront renovation contest. Last spring, two teams from the Architecture Club participated in Design Village 2011 at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, which draws architecture programs from across the state. Students designed, constructed, and lived in a structure that met a variety of content criteria. CSM students won an honorable mention for one of their structures and inspired a new judging category. This year, the club plans to participate with three or four teams.

II. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLOs)

a. Please list the courses, if any, for which SLOs have not been assessed. What assessment is planned for these courses? What assistance or resources would help to complete assessment?

SLOs have been assessed for all courses (ARCH 100, 120, 140, 210, 220, 666). However the results of assessment have not been entered into Trackdat. The lead faculty for architecture and engineering will take care of Trackdat entry before the end of the spring semester, 2012.

b. Please list any degrees offered. Have SLOs been identified for each degree? Briefly describe the department's plan for assessment.

A.S. Architecture: degree SLOs have been submitted to and reviewed by the Assessment Committee. The department plans to use a student self-assessment exit survey as the initial means of assessment.

c. Please list any certificates offered. Have SLOs been identified for each certificate? Briefly describe the department's plan for assessment.

N/A

d. Based on assessment results, 1) what changes will the department consider or implement to improve student learning; and 2) what, if any, resources will the department or program require to implement these changes? (Please itemize these resources in section VII of this document.)

Overall student learning in architecture classes is strong, with many students in each class demonstrating student learning outcomes at an advanced level and nearly all students accomplishing student learning out comes at either a rudimentary or advanced level.

Student learning could be improved through an improvement in the facilities available for the drawing and studio courses. These courses are currently held in 19-114 ("the studio"), a room that has not been renovated in recent memory. Window coverings do not fully cover the windows, there is no built-in projector, walls have not been painted in years, work surfaces and storage for student work in progress are inadequate for the number of students enrolled. Whereas a high power environment can help motive students toward high performance, the run-down infrastructure of 19-114 perpetuates a sloppy, down-scale attitude which students and faculty must constantly battle. e. Below please update the program's SLO Alignment Grid below. The column headings identify the General Education (GE) SLOs. In the row headings (down the left-most column), input the course numbers (e.g. ENGL 100); add or remove rows as necessary. Then mark the corresponding boxes for each GE-SLO with which each course aligns.

If this *Program Review and Planning* report refers to a vocational program or a certificate program that aligns with alternative institutional-level SLOs, please replace the GE-SLOs with the appropriate corresponding SLOs.

GE-SLOs→ Program	Effective Communication	Quantitative Skills	Critical Thinking	Social Awareness	Ethical Responsibility
Courses ↓				and Diversity	
Arch 100	Х		Х	Х	Х
Arch 120	Х	Х	Х		
Arch 140					
Arch 210	Х	Х	Х	Х	
Arch 220	Х	Х	Х		
Arch 666			Х	Х	Х

III. DATA EVALUATION

a. Referring to the Enrollment and WSCH data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, what programmatic, course offering or scheduling changes do trends in these areas suggest? Will any major changes being implemented in the program (e.g. changes in prerequisites, to-be-arranged hours (TBA), lab components. etc.) require significant adjustments to the Enrollment and WSCH projections?

The decline in WSCH from 2008-9 to 2010-11 is directly attributable to reduction of sections resulting from the elimination of second year courses and the fall offering of ARCH 100. LOAD has increased from 567 to 716 during this period. Spring WSCH and LOAD are lower than fall. Some attrition in the majors courses is to be expected, as students may decide that an architecture major and the time and commitment required in studio classes is not compatible with their interests and other commitments.

Without any changes in offerings, WSCH and LOAD should remain roughly constant. Students, especially those planning to transfer to Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, would benefit from a portfolio development course that would follow the first year classes. Such a course is likely to have enrollments at or below the level of the spring courses and would result in an increase in WSCH but a small decrease in LOAD.

b. Referring to the Classroom Teaching FTEF data, evaluate the current data and projections. If applicable, how does the full-time and part-time FTEF affect program action steps and outcomes? What programmatic changes do trends in this area suggest?

Since its return in Fall 2007, the architecture program has been staffed by dedicated adjunct instructors who are also practicing architects. This has enriched students' classroom experiences, as they are exposed to the viewpoints and expertise of multiple professionals. However, there is a dire need for either a full-time faculty member or for release time for a part time instructor to coordinate the program, market it to the

community, modify offerings to promote articulation, and lead efforts such as assessment and program review.

c. Referring to the Productivity (LOAD) data, discuss and evaluate the program's productivity relative to its target number. If applicable, what programmatic changes or other measures will the department consider or implement in order to reach its productivity target? If the productivity target needs to be adjusted, please provide a rationale.

As noted above, program LOAD has increased from 567 to 716 during the past three years and is above the average for the Math/Science division. Give the physical constraints of a single studio space and instructor-student ratios appropriate for lab courses that include frequent critiques of student work, LOAD is not likely to increase.

IV. STUDENT SUCCESS EVALUATION AND ANALYSIS

a. Considering the overall "Success" and "Retention" data, briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs relative to current, past, and projected program and college student success rates.

Overall success and retention rates are comparable to those for the math/science division as a whole. The program continues to provide career exploration and serve as a gateway to careers in architecture and related fields.

Discuss distance education (online and hybrid modes) success and retention data and, where possible, compare with data for on campus sections.

Architecture courses are not currently offered through distance education.

If applicable, identify unmet student needs related to student success and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success. (Note that item IV b, below, specifically addresses equity, diversity, age, and gender.)

Though not captured in the tabulated student success data, there is an unmet need for continued portfolio development opportunities to enhance students' transfer success. As noted in IId, there is also a need for improved physical facilities. A modern and more professional studio space will help students develop a professional outlook and professional work habits.

c. Briefly discuss how effectively the program addresses students' needs specifically relative to equity, diversity, age, and gender. If applicable, identify unmet student needs and describe programmatic changes or other measures the department will consider or implement in order to improve student success with specific regard to equity, diversity, age, and gender.

Architecture courses are taken by students with a broad range of ethnicity. The small number of students in the program makes it difficult to draw conclusions about success across groups. Like other community college programs, the architecture at CSM serves as a gateway for traditionally underrepresented students. Women and non-white students make up a higher percentage of architecture students (57% and 60%

respectively) than of practicing professionals (20% and 18% respectively, 2009 AIA Firm Survey reported at <u>http://www.aia.org/about/initiatives/AIAB081825</u>).

V. REFLECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL FACTORS AND PROGRAM/STUDENT

a. Using the matrix provided below and reflecting on the program relative to students' needs, briefly analyze the program's strengths and weaknesses and identify opportunities for and possible threats to the program (SWOT analysis). See page 10 for definition of SWOT). Consider both external and internal factors. For example, if applicable, you might consider changes in our community and beyond (demographic, educational, social, economic, workforce, and, perhaps, global trends); look at the demand for the program; program review links to other college and District programs and services offered; look at similar programs at other area colleges; and investigate auxiliary funding.

	INTERNAL FACTORS	External Factors
Strengths	 small class size supports student- to- student learning, positive studio environment, positive student-teacher ratio students learn from local practicing architects; team instructional approach provides varied expertise & avoids singular source limitation inexpensive program allows for students to explore architecture /design and evaluate if it the right fit for them before investing excessive time and money dedicated studio space for architecture student use 	 rich design/creative community and region several local transfer schools local interest in quality design, high property values keeps quality design as an added community value strong historical and continuing relationship with local design community divisional administrative support for development of program
Weaknesses	 limited space in studio shabby studio provides a poor design example desks/work surfaces in need of replacement; inhibits studio work lack of "smart classroom" facilities restrict instructional opportunities adjunct faculty do not have sufficient time to devote to program development 	 current economy offers reduced career opportunities lack of awareness of program within college and district economy may impact time availability of adjunct faculty
Opportunities	 access to digital media courses increase use of software/digital tools for drawing, graphic communication, and design; increase student design & graphic skills 	 increased outreach from transfer programs including UC Berkeley and Cal Poly San Luis Obispo

 Threats studio space size and condition limits enrollment numbers, functionality, and student interest small class sizes and attrition limit ability to offer advanced courses 	 lack of funding lack of awareness of program, needs, and nature of architectural education
--	---

b. If applicable, discuss how new positions, other resources, and equipment granted in previous years have contributed towards reaching program action steps and towards overall programmatic health. If new positions, equipment, or other resources have been requested but not granted, discuss how this has impacted overall programmatic health. (You might reflect on data from Core Program and Student Success Indicators for this section.)

Funding received in 2009 allowed purchase of adjustable height table legs and replacement surfaces for existing drawing tables. The table legs (combined with 10 existing door-type table tops) provided additional student work surfaces in 19-114 and allowed enrollment limits in drawing and studio courses to be increased.

VI. Goals, Action Steps, and Outcomes

- a. Identify the program's goals. Goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate <u>some sort of measurable action</u> and should connect to CSM's Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP); Data Updates to EMP, 2011-12; College Index, 2008/9-2011/12; Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011; 5 & 5 College Strategies; GE-SLOs; SLOs.)
 - 1. Increase program enrollment by improving awareness at high schools, at CSM, and at Cañada and Skyline Colleges.
 - 2. Improve articulation with transfer schools.
 - 3. Improve studio environment and functionality for instruction, student work, and student presentations.
 - 4. Increase student skill and confidence with digital design communication tools.
 - 5. Obtain additional support for program development and coordination to accomplish goals 1-4.
- b. Identify the action steps your program will undertake to meet the goals you have identified.

To increase program enrollment and awareness of program (Goal 1):

- Develop program literature
- Visit local high schools
- Exhibit student work locally

To improve articulation with transfer schools (Goal 2):

- Review curriculum at transfer schools and a well-articulated community colleges
- Modify curriculum based on findings
- Renew relationships with transfer schools
- Maintain and increase awareness of current architecture teaching approaches

To improve the studio environment (Goal 3):

- Purchase and install new shades
- Clean and paint the studio
- Improve access to outlets/power for student use of computers, glue guns, light power tools
- Install wall finishes and fixtures to allow display and storage of student work
- Install projector in a permanent and safer location
- Repurpose 19-1xx (old dark room) to support studio activity

To Increase student skill with digital design communication tools (Goal 4):

- Develop an architecture-specific digital media course or
- Work with Digital Media program to incorporate architecture applications into existing DGME courses or
- Integrate additional digital media in current courses

To obtain additional support for program development and coordination (Goal 5):

- Request a full time faculty position or
- Request release time for adjunct faculty
- c. Briefly explain, specifically, how the program's goals and their actions steps relate to CSM's Educational Master Plan, 2008 (EMP); Data Updates to EMP, 2011-12; College Index, 2008/9-2011/12; Institutional Priorities, 2008-2011; and 5 & 5 College Strategies.

Goals 1 and 2 and the associated action steps focus on increasing the transfer pathway for students interested in architecture and related environmental design majors. This supports Institutional Priorities 1 (Student Success) and 3 (Relevant High Quality Programs and Services).

Goal 3 addresses the improvement of the physical facilities used by students and faculty in the drawing and studio classes, bringing them closer to the level of facilities elsewhere on campus. By providing a more inspiring and professional student workspace, this supports Institutional Priorities 1 (Student Success), 2 (Academic Excellence), and 3 (Relevant High Quality Programs and Services).

Goal 4 addresses the need for students to become skilled with the digital tools that are used in upper division courses and are a major part of professional practice. This supports Institutional Priorities 1 (Student Success), 2 (Academic Excellence), and 3 (Relevant High Quality Programs and Services).

Goal 5 addresses the faculty time needed to accomplish the other goals, supporting Institutional Priorities 1 (Student Success), 2 (Academic Excellence), and 3 (Relevant High Quality Programs and Services).

d. Identify and explain the program's outcomes, the measurable "mileposts" which will allow you to determine when the goals are reached.

Outcome 1: increased enrollment as evidenced by full fall sections and, given natural attrition, closer to full spring sections

Outcome 2: formal articulation of major courses with all CSU and UC programs where possible; formal or informal articulation with private and western region public schools where possible; a summary of the constraints that prevent articulation in other cases.

Outcome 3: improvements to the architecture studio in 19-114

Outcome 4: greater emphasis on digital tools in the curriculum; possible introduction of a related course or program SLO

Outcome 5: a full time architecture faculty position, a full time position shared with another program, or compensated release time for adjunct faculty is in place

VII. SUMMARY OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO REACH PROGRAM ACTION STEPS

a. In the matrices below, itemize the resources needed to reach program action steps and describe the expected outcomes for program improvement.* Specifically, describe the potential outcomes of receiving these resources and the programmatic impact if the requested resources cannot be granted.

* *Note:* Whenever possible, requests should stem from assessment of SLOs and the resulting program changes or plans. Ideally, SLOs are assessed, the assessments lead to planning, and the resources requested link directly to those plans.

Full-Time Faculty Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
One full time faculty position or release time for an adjunct faculty member equivalent to 3 – 5 FLCs per semester.	The success of architecture students, both in their studies at CSM and in their ability to transfer, requires evaluation of curriculum, attention to articulation, the development and modification of courses, the development of new aspects of the program, and increased interaction between architecture and other programs. These tasks are best done by a full time faculty member, but could also be carried out by an experienced part time instructor with sufficient release time.	Increasing the programs visibility and bringing spring classes closer to full enrollment is greatly hindered by the lack of a full-time faculty member or of release time for a part time instructor. Time is outside of instruction hours is needed to coordinate the program, market it to the community, pursue articulation, and lead efforts such as assessment and program review.

Classified Positions Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted	If applicable, briefly indicate
	and Expected Impact if Not	how the requested resources

	Granted	will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
None	Input text here.	Input text here.

b. For instructional resources including equipment and materials, please list the exact items you want to acquire and the total costs, including tax, shipping, and handling. Include items used for <u>instruction</u> (such as computers, furniture for labs and centers) and all materials designed for use by students and instructors as a learning resource (such as lab equipment, books, CDs, technology-based materials, educational software, tests, non-printed materials). Add rows to the tables as necessary. If you have questions as to the specificity required, please consult with your division dean. Please list by priority.

Resources Requested	Expected Outcomes if Granted and Expected Impact if Not Granted	If applicable, <u>briefly</u> indicate how the requested resources will link to achieving department action steps based on SLO assessment.
Item: New or repaired window coverings for 19-114. Number: N/A Vendor: Unit price: estimate: \$2000 Total Cost: \$2000 Status*: Replacement	Current window coverings are broken and do not darken room sufficiently for projection of instructor material and student presentations.	Installation of new or repaired shades is an action step under Goal 3: Improve the studio environment.
Item: New paint or other wall finish in 19-114. Number: N/A Vendor: Unit price: estimate: \$2500 (clean and paint) Total Cost: \$2500 Status*: Maintenance	The studio room has not been repainted in many years and looks dilapidated. Ideally, the wall finish could support the display of student work.	Cleaning and painting the studio is an action step under Goal 3: Improve the studio environment.
Item: Shelving and other fixtures in 19-114. Number: N/A Vendor: Ikea, DataPrint, or similar Unit price: estimate: \$1500 Total Cost: \$1500 Status*: Replacement	Display and storage space in 19-114 is not sufficient for the larger sized fall classes.	Display and storage space for student work is an action step under Goal 3: Improve the studio environment.
Item: Electrical work in 19-114 to provide power at student workspaces Number: N/A Vendor: Facilities or contractor Unit price: estimate: \$3000 Total Cost: \$3 000 Status*: Maintenance	Students use glue guns and light power tools at their workspaces in 19-114. Power is available at only a few perimeter locations in the room. The resulting use of extension cords creates a tripping hazard.	Improved access to outlets/power for student use of computers, glue guns, and light power tools in 19-114 is an action step under Goal 3: Improve the studio environment.

Item: Books Number: N/A Vendor: various Unit price: estimate: \$500 Total Cost: \$500 Status*: New	The collection of specialized architecture books that faculty and students use in all classes has not been updated in many years.	Better access to examples of current architecture will improve student learning.
Item: Prints Number: N/A Vendor: various Unit price: estimate: \$500 Total Cost: \$500 Status*: New	The collection of architecture prints that faculty and students use in all classes has not been updated in many years.	Better access to examples of current architecture will improve student learning.

*Status = New, Upgrade, Replacement, Maintenance or Repair.

VIII. Course Outlines

a. By course number (e.g. CHEM 210), please list all department or program courses included in the most recent college catalog, the date of the current Course Outline for each course, and the due date of each course's next update.

Course Number	Last Update Date	Six-year Update Due Date
ARCH 100	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)
ARCH 120	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)
ARCH 140	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)
ARCH 210	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)
ARCH 220	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)
ARCH 666	March, 2011	November, 2016 (for 2017-8 catalog)

IX. Advisory and Consultation Team (ACT)

a. Please list non-program faculty who have participated on the program's Advisory and Consultation Team. Their charge is to review the *Program Review and Planning* report before its submission and to provide a brief written report with comments, commendations, and suggestions to the Program Review team. Provided that they come from outside the program's department, ACT members may be solicited from faculty at CSM, our two sister colleges, other community colleges, colleges or universities, and professionals in relevant fields. The ACT report should be attached to this document upon submission.

List ACT names here. Laura Demsetz, Professor of Engineering

Attach or paste ACT report here.

Architecture is a specialized and demanding major. Transfer preparation includes the architecture sequence and also calculus and physics. CSM's architecture program continues to serve our community well by allowing students to explore architecture as a major before transfer. Students who complete the architecture courses at CSM experience the rigors of studio work and develop the knowledge and skills to move on in the field. Students have

opportunities for professional development outside the classroom through an active Architecture club.

The architecture faculty members are a talented group of practicing architects who take time out of their professional lives to help develop future architects. CSM architecture students are fortunate to have such guidance. Comments from recent graduates of the program indicate that students are extremely well-prepared for the major classes at transfer schools. That so much has been accomplished since the program returned from hiatus is a testament to the dedication of the faculty members.

The program faculty have accurately identified two key needs for the continued success of the program: a "face lift" for the classroom/studio space in 19-114 and release time for program coordination. It is a shame that the space available to architecture students is among the shabbiest on campus. With a relatively small investment, the college could upgrade 19-114 and bring it closer to the quality of instructional facilities elsewhere on campus. Release time for program coordination is especially important over the few years, as discipline expertise will be needed to address upcoming changes in transfer requirements at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo.

b. Briefly describe the program's response to and intended incorporation of the ACT report recommendations.

X. PROGRAM REVIEW PARTICIPANTS AND SIGNATURES

Date of Program Review evaluation:

Please list the department's Program Review and Planning report team:

Primary program contact person: Laura Demsetz Phone and email address: 650 574-6617, demsetz@smccd.edu Full-time faculty: none Part-time faculty: John Lucchesi, George Sun, Jacqueline Yahn Administrators Classified staff: Students:

Primary Program Contact Person's Signature	Date
Full-time Faculty's Signature	Date
Part-time Faculty's Signature	Date
Classified Staff Person's Signature	Date
Student's Signature	Date
Dean's Signature	Date