

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Program Name: Architecture  
Faculty Contact: Laura Demsetz

Academic Year: 2012-13  
Program Review Submission Date: April 12, 2013

### I. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's [College Mission and Diversity Statements](#), [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), [5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate.

College of San Mateo's architecture program prepares students to transfer to B.A. and B.Arch programs and related environmental design majors through five major-specific courses. In addition, the program supports both architecture majors and the campus as a whole through ARCH 100, a general education course that satisfies CSU-GE Area C1 and IGETC Area 3A. Students can earn an A.S. degree in architecture, which may assist them in finding employment. However, the entry-level professional degree is the B.Arch (or for students earning a B.A. degree, the M.Arch). B.Arch programs at public universities in California are highly impacted at the freshman level, restricting access for students who cannot afford a private college education.

As the only architecture transfer program in the district, CSM's architecture program serves as a gateway to architecture and related professions and supports the college mission of providing educational opportunity to residents of San Mateo County and the Greater Bay Area. The program promotes student engagement (an objective under Institutional Priority 2: Promote Academic Excellence) by developing students' interest in art and design into professional skills/abilities that impact the community through the built environment. Students experience this impact through classroom and club projects that reach into the community, such as PARK(ing) Day installations in downtown San Mateo, storefront renovation projects, a recent exhibit of student work at the Foster City Library, and the Architecture Club's participation in the Design Village event at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, for which student teams design, construct, and live in structures that meet specified constraints.

### II. Summary of Student and Program Data

#### A. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Summarize recent SLO assessments, identify trends, and discuss areas in need of improvement.

Only one section of each architecture course is offered each academic year. Currently, all SLOs are assessed with each offering of each course, with TracDat entry in June for the academic year. Results from 2011-2012 show that the 80% threshold for success is met in all courses for all SLOs; most students who successfully complete courses achieve an advanced (rather than rudimentary) level of proficiency.

#### B. Student Success Indicators

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

1. Review [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) and discuss any differences in student success indicators across demographic variables. Also refer to the [College Index](#) and other relevant sections of the [Educational Master Plan: Update, 2012](#), e.g., Student Outcomes and Student Outcomes: Transfer. Basic Skills programs should also refer to [ARCC](#) data.

Over the past three years, there has been a significant improvement in the success (64.3% → 81.5%) and retention (78.7% → 91%) of students in the architecture program. Students who classify themselves as Filipino or Hispanic have significantly higher success rates than the college average. Success rates are significantly lower than the college average only for students who classify themselves as Pacific Islander; this result is based on relatively small numbers of students. Female students tend to be more successful than male students. In the past two years, the few students in their 30s have been less successful than students in other age ranges.

Like other community college programs, the architecture program at CSM serves as a gateway for traditionally underrepresented students. Women and non-white students make up a higher percentage of CSM's architecture students (34% and 71% respectively) than of practicing professionals (20% and 18% respectively, 2009 AIA Firm Survey reported at <http://www.aia.org/about/initiatives/AIAB081825>).

2. Discuss any differences in student success indicators across modes of delivery (on-campus versus distance education). Refer to [Delivery Mode Course Comparison](#).

All architecture classes are offered on campus.

### C. Program Efficiency Indicators. Do we deliver programs efficiently given our resources?

Summarize trends in program efficiency as indicated in the [Student Success and Core Program Indicators](#) (LOAD, Full-time and Part-Time FTEF, etc.).

LOAD for the architecture program in 2011-12 was 544, slightly above the college LOAD of 532. Course offerings have been constant over the past two years; the small increase in FTEF from 10-11 to 11-12 is due to load associated with TBA hours. Of concern are low enrollments in the spring major classes (Arch 140 and Arch 220), which have fall major classes as prerequisites. The program is considering a change to the sequencing of courses in order to provide students with a more gradual introduction to the studio environment and increase retention.

Since its return from hiatus 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, lead high school and community outreach, modify the curriculum to promote articulation, and lead efforts such as SLO assessment and program review.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

The full time engineering faculty member, who currently helps with SLO assessment and program review, does not have the discipline expertise or professional experience needed for curriculum development and community outreach.

### D. Course Outline Updates

Review the [course outline update record](#). List the courses that will be updated in the next academic year. For each course that will be updated, provide a faculty contact and the planned submission month. See the [Committee on Instruction website](#) for [course submission instructions](#). Contact your division's [COI representatives](#) if you have questions about submission deadlines. Career and Technical Education courses must be updated every two years.

Courses to be updated	Faculty contact	Submission month
All courses were revised for the 2011-12 catalog.	Laura Demsetz	

### E. Website Review

Review the program's website(s) annually and update as needed.

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Laura Demsetz	Website was updated in March 2013 and will be reviewed again in July 2013.

### F. Additional Career Technical Education Data – CTE programs only. (This information is required by California Ed. Code 78016.)

1. Review the program's [Gainful Employment Disclosure Data](#), [External Community](#), and other institutional research or labor market data as applicable. Explain how the program meets a documented labor market demand without unnecessary duplication of other training programs in the area. Summarize student outcomes in terms of degrees, certificates, and employment. Identify areas of accomplishment and areas of concern.

N/A (transfer program)

2. Review and update the program's Advisory Committee information. Provide the date of most recent advisory committee meeting.

N/A (transfer program)

## III. Student Learning Outcomes Scheduling and Alignment

Program Review: Enter Program Name

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### A. Course SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the course SLO assessment process or schedule.

No modifications proposed; each SLO will continue to be assessed with each course offering.

### B. Program SLO Assessment

Explain any recent or projected modifications to the program SLO assessment process or schedule.

Program SLOs are in place and are currently assessed through an exit survey associated with the AS degree application

### C. SLO Alignment

Discuss how Course SLOs support Program SLOs. Discuss how Course and/or Program SLOs support Institutional/GE SLOs. Refer to [TracDat](#) related Program and Institutional SLO reports.

Each course supports one or more program SLOs. Although there is extensive design work in several courses, no course SLOs are currently linked to program SLO 4 “Successfully carry out both individual and collaborative work as a part of a design team.” Linkage will be discussed by program faculty as part of spring 2013 review of assessment results. Taken together, the architecture courses support the following institutional SLOs: Effective Communication, Quantitative Skills, Critical Thinking.

## IV. Additional Factors

Discuss additional factors as applicable that impact the program, including changes in student populations, state-wide initiatives, transfer requirements, advisory committee recommendations, legal mandates, workforce development and employment opportunities, community needs. See [Institutional Research](#) as needed.

**Demand:** The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects a 24% increase in the demand for architects between 2010 and 2020, greater than the average increase for all occupations [Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2012-13 Edition*, Architects, <http://www.bls.gov/ooh/architecture-and-engineering/architects.htm>]. Regional interest in environmentally sensitive or “green” design continues to be strong and may lead to increased interest in the architecture program. For example, the San Mateo County Office of Education held a Green Collar Career Summit for high school counselors on March 22, which included a panel discussion on sustainable design and a presentation by CSM outreach staff and faculty that highlighted architecture

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

and other programs.

**Curriculum:** The architecture major at CSM helps students to determine well before transfer whether architecture is a good fit for their interests and abilities. This means that some attrition in the program is to be expected. However, low enrollment in the spring major courses (Arch 140, Arch 220) is of concern. Although the program is currently structured and offered so that students can complete both drawing and studio courses in a single academic year, the combined 7-unit load of Arch 666, Arch 120, and Arch 210 in the fall semester is more than many students take. Rather than allowing students to “dip their toes in and test the waters” of the major, the courses are currently scheduled to encourage students to “jump into the deep end.” Many are unwilling to do so and some who do may not be able to “learn to swim” quickly enough. A more gradual introduction to the demands of a studio class may attract more students to the program and also reduce attrition. In addition, the curriculum should be reviewed in response to recent changes in the first-year design sequence at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo; these changes integrate greater exposure to site conditions and increased use of computer-based tools earlier in the curriculum and place a greater emphasis on portfolio evaluation.

**Facilities:** 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 motivate students toward high performance, the run-down infrastructure of 19-114 perpetuates a sloppy, down-scale attitude which students and faculty must constantly battle.

**Support:** The program continues to receive strong support from the local design community. Students recently toured the Facebook campus and presented to a panel of architects their design work in preparation for this year’s Design Village competition at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. The architecture profession, both locally and nationally, continues to view community college transfer programs as an important means of developing diversity within the profession. Architecture faculty members invest many hours in support of the program beyond their formal teaching responsibilities. However, outreach and curriculum development continue to be hampered by the lack of either a full time faculty member or release time for adjunct faculty.

### V. Institutional Planning

#### A. Results of Plans and Actions

The following progress has been made on the goals and actions included in the Spring 2012 Comprehensive Program review (note: these goals and actions were for a three-year period).

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

## **INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

- Develop program literature – **Informal information flyer developed**; more formal brochure needed in print and online.
- Visit local high schools – **Program included in San Mateo County Office of Education’s March 2012 Green Collar Career Summit**
- Exhibit student work locally - **Arch 140 student work was displayed at the Foster City Library in March 2013.**

To improve articulation with transfer schools (Goal 2): **A new course, Arch 680 MA, Making Architecture: Building Methods and Materials, was developed to facilitate articulation with Cal Pol SLO; course was cancelled Sp13 due to insufficient enrollment. Release time for curriculum review and development remains a critical program need.**

- Review curriculum at transfer schools and at 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):

**Facilities staff developed estimates for the first three items listed below, but final funding was not approved. A more functional, safer, and more inspiring studio environment remains a critical program need.**

- 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):

**DRAF is introducing a REVIT course in F13. Some additional coverage of software tools has been incorporated into ARCH 120 and ARCH 140.**

- 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):

**A full time faculty position or release time for adjunct faculty to coordinate the program remains a critical program need.**

- Request a full time faculty position or
- Request release time for adjunct faculty

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

### B. Program Vision

What is the program's vision for sustaining and improving student learning and success during the *next six years*? Make connections to the [College Mission and Diversity Statements, Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#), and other [institutional planning documents](#) as appropriate. Address trends in the SLO assessment results and student success indicators and data noted in Section II. Summary of Student and Program Data.

[*Note*: CTE programs must address changes in the context of completion and employment rates, anticipated labor demand, and any overlap with similar programs in the area as noted in Sections II.F.1 and II.F.2.]

[*Note*: Specific plans to be implemented in the *next year* should be entered in Section V.C.]

*Architects*—licensed professionals trained in the art and science of building design—transform society's need for places to live, work, learn, and play 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.

The architecture program's vision is to help students with an interest in art, design, and the environment develop the creative problem solving skills and discipline knowledge needed for successful transfer and eventual professional employment in architecture, design, and urban planning. Carrying out this vision requires outreach to students, ongoing review and improvement of the curriculum, enhanced communication with transfer schools, and facilities that provide a productive work environment.

Overall, student learning in architecture is strong, with nearly all students accomplishing student learning outcomes at either a rudimentary or advanced level. Enrollment in fall courses is strong. One of the purposes of the architecture major at CSM is for students to determine well before transfer whether architecture is a good fit for their interests and abilities. This means that some attrition in the program is to be expected. However, spring enrollment in the "major" courses (Arch 140, Arch 220) is low than desired. Students who stick with and do well in the major courses are able to do the level of work required by transfer institutions; in fall 2012, four students transferred to the architecture program at U.C. Berkeley, one to the program at USC, and one to the program at USF.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Key to the program's vision is increased visibility among high school and community college students in the county. Students with an interest in art, design, or the environment may not be aware of architecture as a major, the varied career options available to architecture and environmental design majors, or the math and physics requirements of many architecture programs. Informing students about architecture as a major and CSM's program in particular can be accomplished through increased outreach to high school art, design, and graphics classes; continued participation in CSM events such as Connect to College and Jazz on the Hill; ongoing support of class and club projects with community impact such as PARK(ing) Day; and continued interaction with the San Mateo chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

The program is currently structured and offered so that students can complete all major drawing and studio courses in a single academic year, a hold-over from a time when a second year of major courses was also offered. A more gradual introduction may attract more students to the program and also reduce attrition after the first semester. Most students take two or three years to complete their major and general education transfer preparation, so a revised course schedule in which the studio sequence is completed in fall before transfer would allow students to develop a stronger portfolio without increasing the time to transfer. Class offerings should also be reviewed in the context of recent changes in the first-year design sequence at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo; these changes integrate greater exposure to site conditions and constraints and increased use of computer-based tools earlier in the curriculum and place a greater emphasis on portfolio evaluation.

To continue to provide viable transfer preparation, the architecture program must retain articulation with Cal Poly San Luis Obispo and U.C. Berkeley and expand articulation to other programs. Enhanced communication between CSM architecture faculty and the faculty at transfer schools will help the program anticipate changes in transfer requirements. Most architecture programs include a portfolio review as part of the transfer process. Enhanced communication with faculty at transfer schools will also allow CSM architecture faculty to provide better guidance to students regarding portfolio development.

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 outcomes at either a rudimentary or advanced level. However, there is room for improvement. Architecture students spend a great deal of time on campus working on class projects. Student learning could be improved through an upgrade of the facilities available for the drawing and studio courses. These courses are currently held in 19-114, which needs new window coverings, additional power outlets, and other upgrades to become a safe and productive working environment. Student learning would be enhanced further by a larger workspace, which would allow more room for studio work, model building, storage, and display of work for critiques. A larger space equipped with a projector and



## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

movable chairs would allow the program to offer double sections (common lecture with parallel lab/studio). Fall class sizes could then be increased, which would provide stronger feed into the spring courses

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional enrichment activities that would be most effective in carrying out the program's vision to improve student learning and success.

Student learning and students' ultimate success in the architecture field would be enhanced by professional enrichment activities that provide the opportunity for adjunct faculty to learn about new teaching strategies in architecture and to form closer ties with their peers at transfer institutions. For example, professional enrichment funds might be used to sponsor campus visits by architecture faculty and a counselor or advisor.

2. To guide future collaboration across student services, learning support centers, and instructional programs, describe the interactions that would help the program to improve student success.

Architecture students are often unprepared for the math and physics courses required for transfer and can benefit from continued access to tutoring and support in the MRC, ISC, and Learning Center.

3. To guide the [Institutional Planning Committee](#) (IPC) in long-range planning, discuss any major changes in resource needs anticipated in the *next six years*. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation. Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated. Specific resource requests for the next academic year should be itemized in Section VI.A below.

Faculty: If the program grows to the point where more than one section of each course can be offered in each academic year, there will be a need for a full time faculty member to staff and coordinate the program.

Equipment and Technology: At some point, curriculum changes at transfer schools will lead to an increased use of computer-based design tools. With appropriate scheduling and funding, access to computers and software could met through the drafting/CAD lab and the CIS Computer Center

Instructional Materials: Additional funds for instructional materials and supplies will be needed if curriculum review and restructuring leads to the inclusion of more complex fabrication techniques for models and mock-ups.

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

Classified Staff: none

Facilities: Architecture students need a better working environment. The architecture classroom/studio space in 19-114 is in desperate of an upgrade. As the program grows, additional work and storage space will be needed.

### C. Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success

Prioritize the plans to be carried out next year to sustain and improve student success. Briefly describe each plan and how it supports the [Institutional Priorities, 2008-2013](#). For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes.

#### Plan 1

Title:

Architecture Studio Modernization
-----------------------------------

Description

<p>Architecture students spend lecture, lab, TBA, and many additional hours working on class projects in 19-114, the “studio.” Current study conditions are not conducive to learning. Window coverings are broken and do not darken room sufficiently for projection of instructor and student presentations. Only a portable projector is available; the extension cords required for its use create a tripping hazard. Students use glue guns and light power tools at their workspaces, but power is available at only a few perimeter locations in the room. The resulting use of extension cords creates a tripping hazard. The room has not been repainted in many years and looks dilapidated. Display and storage space in is not sufficient for the larger fall classes.</p>
--

<p>To provide a safe and productive learning environment, the poor working conditions in 19-114 must be remedied or another space for the program must be found. A larger space would allow double sections to be offered.</p>
--

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Install new or repaired window coverings in 19-114.	Summer 2013	Students are able to see projected material.
Provide power at student workspaces in 19-114	Summer 2013	Students can use glue guns and light power tools without tripping hazard.
Install permanent projector in 19-114	Summer 2013	Student and instructor presentations can be

## INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE

		projected without tripping hazard
Install additional shelving or other display fixtures in 19-114	Spring 2014	Display and storage space is sufficient to for current student work.
Repaint or provide other wall finishes in 19-114	Spring 2014	Working environment is pleasant and professional.

### Plan 2

Title:

Architecture Curriculum Review and Restructuring
--

#### Description

To promote student learning and to maintain and increase articulation with B.A. and B.Arch programs, the architecture curriculum should be reviewed and possibly revised and restructured.

At the February department meeting, faculty discussed a variety of ways to modify the program so that it presents a gentler, more gradual introduction to architecture practice while still bringing students to the level of knowledge, skill, and professionalism that will be expected of them at transfer.

Prior to the possible revision or restructuring of the program, it is important for the faculty to discuss current transfer requirements and any anticipated changes with their counterparts at transfer institutions. While these discussions can begin by phone and through email, the nature of studio work and the use of portfolio review in transfer admissions are such that it is helpful for at least one faculty member to visit U.C. Berkeley, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, California College of the Arts and possibly additional schools (Cal Poly Pomona, UCLA, University of San Francisco University, Academy of Art) to establish a working relationship with faculty involved transfer admission and portfolio review.

Because the architecture program is staffed by adjunct faculty, additional funding is needed to support the faculty time required for this major review of the curriculum.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Faculty review current articulation.	Spring 2013	Gaps in articulation are identified.
Faculty interact with counterparts at transfer schools through email and telephone to learn about transfer school curriculum, articulation, and transfer admission process.	Summer 2013, Fall 2013	CSM faculty understand the curricular content, objectives, and learning outcomes that are needed for articulation.
Faculty visit transfer schools to review curriculum, student projects, and	Summer 2013, Fall 2013	CSM faculty understand the specific types of student

**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

articulation.		assignments that are needed for articulation and the criteria used the portfolio review.
Curriculum revision: Course outlines are revised or developed as needed to support articulation. Course sequencing is revised to promote learning and retention and support timely development of student portfolios.	Fall 2013	New and modified course outlines are submitted to COI by the 2014-15 catalog deadline.
Update transfer guidance: The architecture web page and transfer guide are updated to reflect curricular changes and the suggested sequence of courses. This information is shared with counselors. Updated and new articulation agreements are requested through Articulation Officer. On an ongoing basis, review changes in articulation and transfer requirements.	Spring 2014	Students have access to current transfer information through the architecture website. Counselors are aware of changes. Articulation agreements are in place with transfer schools as appropriate.

**Plan 3**

Title:

Architecture Outreach and Coordination
--

Description

After the curriculum review is complete and resulting changes have been made, develop well-designed web and print program information. Work with the Outreach Coordinator to increase the program's visibility among high school students in the county. On an ongoing basis, coordinate additional outreach to high school art, design, and graphics classes.
--

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Faculty (possibly with assistance from students through a class or club project) develop a well-designed program flyer or brochure. The brochure is made available in print form and on the web.	Spring 2014	Print copies of brochure are available for outreach and to counselors. Web version of brochure is in place.
Faculty work with Outreach Coordinator to make sure that architecture is appropriately represented in college outreach efforts.	Spring 2014	Outreach Coordinator and others involved in outreach have current program information.
Faculty contact local high schools to set up and carry out additional outreach to	Spring 2014 and ongoing	Outreach activities (e.g. faculty visits to high school;

**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

art, design, and graphics.		high school student visits to CSM) take place. Students in Fall 2014 classes are surveyed to see if they participated in outreach efforts.
----------------------------	--	--

For additional plans, cut/paste from above and insert here. Or add an additional page. Number your additional plans accordingly.

*[Note: Itemize in Section VI.A. Any additional resources required to implement plans.]*

<b>VI. Resource Requests</b>
------------------------------

*A. Itemized Resource Requests*

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation and to implement the plans listed above.

Faculty

Full-time faculty requests (identify specialty if applicable)	Number of positions
none	Tab to add rows

Complete [Full-Time Faculty Position Request Form](#) for each position.

Description of reassigned or hourly time for prioritized plans	Plan #(s)	Cost
Adjunct faculty hours at special rate for communication with transfer programs, visits to transfer programs, and curriculum development. (55-60 hours, does not include benefits; \$1000 travel costs)	2	\$4000
Ongoing adjunct faculty hours at special rate for program outreach and coordination. (35 hours per year, does not include benefits)	2, 3	\$2000 per year

Equipment and Technology

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
none	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan	Cost
-------------------------------------	------	------

**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

	#(s)	
none		

Instructional Materials

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
none	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost
Printing of program brochures (not really instructional materials, but no place else to list!)	3	\$200

Classified Staff

Description (for ongoing program operation)	Cost
none	

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost
none		

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a [CSM Facility Project Request Form](#).

Description (for prioritized plans)	Plan #(s)	Cost
Install new or repaired window coverings in 19-114.	1	\$2000
Provide power at student workspaces in 19-114	1	\$3000
Install permanent projector in 19-114	1	\$1000
Provide additional shelving or other display fixtures in 19-114	1	\$1500
Repaint or provide other wall finishes in 19-114	1	\$2500

Note: Costs are approximate. Estimates for several of these items were done by Facilities in 2012.

**B. Cost for Prioritized Plans**

Use the resources costs from Section VI.A. above to provide the total cost for each plan.

Plan #	Plan Title	Total Cost
1	Architecture Studio Modernization	\$10,000
2	Architecture Curriculum Review and Restructuring	\$4000 plus \$1000 ongoing

**INSTRUCTION PROGRAM REVIEW: SPRING 2013 SUBMISSION CYCLE**

3	Architecture Outreach and Coordination, one-time	\$200 plus \$1000 ongoing
---	--	------------------------------