College of San Mateo — Program Review Submission

2014-2015 Instructional Program Review

Program Name: **Architecture**
Program Contact: **Demsetz, Laura**
Academic Year: **2014-2015**
Status: **Submitted for review**
Updated on: **03/30/2015 07:28 PM**

1. Description of Program

Provide a brief description of the program and how it supports the college's **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, **5 in 5 College Strategies, Spring 2011**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** 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 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. Design Village draws architecture students from college and universities around the state. The program is delighted to report that one of the three CSM teams participating in spring 2014 was awarded "Best of Show" for their innovative design.

Major courses are offered in the Architecture Studio Lab on the upper floor of building 19, with occasional use of the CIS Computer Center for software applications. An adjoining faculty office is shared by all faculty; an adjoining former darkroom serves as storage space for student work and supplies. For spring 2015, large scale construction associated with architecture club's preparation for Design Village is being carried out in a project workspace in building 12 that is shared with the engineering club's Solar Regatta project. With the planned replacement of buildings 12 and 19 with a new Center for Innovation and Emerging Technologies, the architecture program looks forward to the opportunity to provide students with a more modern workspace including access to shared resources to support design-build projects.

2. Student Learning and Program Data

A. Discuss Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

1. Reflect on recent SLO assessment results for courses offered by the program. 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 2013-

2014 show that the 80% threshold for success continues to be met in all courses for all SLOs. Most students who successfully complete Arch 100, 120, and 140 achieve an advanced (rather than rudimentary) level of proficiency in all SLOs. In the studio courses (Arch 210 and 220), 30-40% of students achieve an advanced level of proficiency.

2. Comment on the success rates in the program SLOs that are aligned with specific course SLOs. What do the program SLO and course data reveal about students completing the program? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement. Is the alignment between course and program SLOs appropriate and informative? See **course-to-program SLO alignment mapping**.

Because all architecture SLO success rates are high, success rates in course SLOs that are aligned with program SLOs are also high. A review of the course and program SLO alignment mapping and the exit survey results yields interesting information regarding the program SLO dealing with collaborative work on a design team (listed as program SLO 4 in the alignment mapping and as program SLO 2 in the exit survey of degree applicants). Although no course SLOs are aligned with this program SLO, all seven students completing the exit survey of degree applicants either strongly agreed (6 of 7) or agreed (1 of 7) that they meet the SLO; that is, that they are able to successfully carry out both individual and collaborative work as part of a design team. Many students who complete the associate degree also participate in the Design Village activity, but this experience is not currently captured through course-level SLOs. The architecture program is proposing a new course that would include a design-build project (with Design Village as one possible option; see Plan 3 under Program Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success) ; an SLO addressing collaborative work on a design team would be appropriate for this course.

3. Evaluate the program SLOs in relation to survey data from the degree and certificate award earners survey. What does the survey data reveal about the effectiveness of the program SLOs? Identify trends and discuss areas in need of improvement.

Results for seven students are reported in the SLO survey of architecture AS degree applicants. All respondents either strongly agreed (6 of 7) or agreed (1 of 7) that they meet three of the program SLOs. The fourth program SLO deals with the use of graphics, including freehand drawing and computer applications. One respondent disagreed strongly that this SLO had been met. Without additional information, we cannot be sure why. However, anecdotal feedback from students who have recently transferred indicates that they are not as experienced with computer applications as their peers (see Plan 2 under Program Plans and Actions to Improve Student Success).

4. Describe any additional methods used to assess program SLOs and reflect on the results of those assessments.

Although faculty receive anecdotal feedback from former students, program-level SLOs are formally assessed only through the associate degree applicant survey and through linkage to course-level SLOs.

5. For any courses in the program that satisfy a GE requirement, which GE SLOs are supported or reinforced by the course SLOs? What do assessment results for the course SLOs reveal about student attainment of the GE SLOs? See **GE SLO Alignment Summary Report** or **All Courses GE SLO Alignment Data**.

Architecture 100 Survey of Modern Architecture satisfies the AA/AS degree humanities requirement (Area E5c) and the AA/AS-T arts requirement (CSU-GE C1, IGETC 3A). *Effective Communication* and *Critical Thinking* are supported by a student's ability to "[d]iscuss visual and social elements embodied in 20th century movements in contemporary architecture" as assessed through a term paper and by a student's ability to "[i]dentify and describe the significant design work, concepts and principles of influential architects and environmental designers from the end of the 19th century to the 21st century" as assessed through final exam questions. *Critical Thinking* and *Social Awareness* are supported by a student's ability to "[d]iscuss and identify critical relationships between architecture or environmental design and human experience and functional needs" as assessed through a term paper. Assessment results for course-level SLOs are well above the program's target of 80%, indicating that students are able to demonstrate these GE SLOs in the context of Architecture 100.

B. Student Success Indicators

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.

In 2013-14, success and retention of students in the architecture program (success: 79.7%; retention: 87.2%) rose from 2012-13 levels (success: 71.3%; retention: 79.6%) but did not reach the 2011-12 highs (success: 81.5%; retention: 91%). Students who classify themselves Hispanic and as Other continue to have higher success rates than the division and college averages. After a dip last year, the success rate for female students returned to its traditionally high level; the success rate for male students was unchanged (female success: 90.4%, up significantly from 61.5%; male success: 74.5%).

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 (35% and 62% 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 2013-14 was 364, reflecting a significant drop in FTES. In 2014-15, the program has made two changes to address declining FTES. To improve retention of students considering architecture as a major, course schedules have been adjusted to allow students to enter the major more gradually. First-year students now begin the Architectural Design Drawing sequence (Arch 120, Arch 140) a semester before the Design Studio sequence (Arch 210, Arch 220). The typical student entering the program now takes three units of major classes in the first semester (Arch 666, Arch 120) and moves on to six units of major classes in the second semester (Arch 140, Arch 210).

The second change that has been made is to offer Architecture 100, which satisfies a general education requirement for the AA/AS degree and for the CSU-GE and IGETC patterns, in both the fall and spring semesters.

Since its return from hiatus in Fall 2007, the architecture program has been staffed by dedicated adjunct instructors who are also practicing architects. This enriches students' classroom experiences, as they are exposed to the viewpoints and expertise of multiple professionals. However, there is a dire need for support 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. 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. The architecture program is grateful to have received an innovation grant that is providing bridge funding to support Design Village and curriculum development this year. However, an ongoing need remains for support outside the classroom.

3. 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 17% increase in the demand for architects between 2012 and 2022, greater than the average increase for all occupations [Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, 2014-15*

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. Several students each year continue to find work in local architect offices prior to transfer.

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 more advanced major courses (Arch 140, Arch 220) has been of concern. Beginning in fall 2014, courses have been scheduled to allow a more gradual introduction to the demands of the field. In addition, increased use of software tools has been incorporated into Arch 120 and 140, a trend that will continue. Taken together, these changes should provide an easier transition for students entering the program and allow students who complete the program to be better prepared for transfer.

Facilities: Exposure to the studio environment and to design-build projects continues to be of critical value in preparing students for transfer. Improvements were made to the Architecture Studio Lab in summer 2013, but students are still hampered by older stools, desks, and parallel bars. The construction of a new Center for Innovation and Emerging Technologies provides an opportunity to modern modernize the studio lab for the architecture program as well as create shared workspaces that support design-build projects in multiple programs.

Support: The program continues to receive strong support from the local design community. Students will once again have the opportunity present to a panel of architects their design work in preparation for the annual 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, all adjunct faculty, invest many hours in support of the program beyond their formal teaching responsibilities, a level of support that is not sustainable without additional resources. In particular, outreach and curriculum development continue to be hampered by the lack of either a full time faculty member or additional support for adjunct faculty.

4. Planning

A. Results of Program Plans and Actions

Describe results, including measurable outcomes, from plans and actions in recent program reviews.

Course schedule revision to promote persistence (2014 plan 1)

The current course schedule was designed to allow students to complete the major classes in one academic year, with both a studio course (Arch 210, Arch 220) and a drawing/visualization course (Arch 120, Arch 140) in each semester. However, most students are at CSM for two or three years prior to transfer. Anecdotal feedback from students indicates that they were unprepared for the time demands associated with the architecture major courses. In addition, Arch 100, which satisfies the Arts requirement in IGETC and CSU-GE and serves as recruitment for the major, is only offered once per year and is usually full.

To provide students with a more gradual introduction to architecture and the demands of studio work, the major classes will be rescheduled so that students can spread their major coursework over two years while still developing a portfolio that supports transfer. In addition, Arch 100 will be offered twice a year and the cross-listing of Arch 120 and Arch 140 in the spring will be considered. This plan does not require additional resources.

Status: Schedule modifications are complete; analysis of outcomes will take place at the end of fall 2015 after one complete cycle of course offerings. **See 2015 plan 1.**

Increased use of software tools for drawing and visualization (2014 plan 2)

To maintain articulation with transfer programs and to improve students' preparation for the design sequence (Arch 210, Arch 220) and for upper division work, increase the use of software tools in Arch 120 and Arch 140. Both courses currently provide some exposure to software tools; this is an increase in emphasis rather than a major curricular change.

Status: The use of SketchUp and Photoshop in Arch 120 and Arch 140 has been increased. However, additional software tools are needed to support presentations in Arch 220 and to prepare students for the work expected of them after transfer. **See 2015 plan 2.**

Institutionalization of support for Design Village (2014 plan 3)

The Architecture Club's participation in the annual Design Village event at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo in an important part of the students' professional development. Students spend much of the spring semester developing designs for a habitable structure that meets specified constraints, then make a formal presentation of their work for critique by a panel of practicing architects. The students then spend a weekend in San Luis Obispo. They and teams from colleges and universities throughout the state construct and live in the structures. The project requires many hours of student time under the supervision of the club advisor. Support for the adjunct faculty member who serves as club advisor continues to be an issue. The program is considering several options for institutionalization of support (for example, through a 0.5 or 1 unit project course), but may need additional support for spring 2015. Adjunct faculty hours at special rate for spring 2015 are included under instructional materials in Section 5 Resource Requests.

Status: Adjunct faculty hours at special rate were not provided as part of the allocation process following program review. However, an Innovation Grant proposal submitted in fall 2014 was funded and is supporting adjunct faculty supervision of Design Village in spring 2015 and the development of a new course that will include a design-build component. **See 2015 plan 3.**

Evaluate recent CSM architecture student experience (2014 plan 4)

To guide program development, work with PRIE to survey recent CSM architecture students to find out how they learned about the program, what worked and didn't work for them while they were taking architecture classes, and what their educational and employment outcomes have been after leaving the program. For students who left without completing the architecture major sequence, learn why they did not complete the sequence. This plan requires assistance from PRIE.

Status: no progress has been made on this plan. **See 2015 plan 4.**

Architecture Curriculum Review (2014 plan 5)

To promote student learning and to maintain and increase articulation with B.A. and B.Arch programs, the architecture faculty must 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.

Status: Funding was requested in the spring 2013 and 2014 program reviews, but was not granted. However, an Innovation Grant proposal submitted in fall 2014 was funded and is supporting adjunct faculty supervision of Design Village in spring 2015 and a more modest curriculum revision effort through fall 2015. **See 2015 plan 5.**

Architecture Outreach and Coordination (2014 plan 6)
After the curriculum review (Plan 5) 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. Adjunct faculty hours at special rate are included under instructional materials in Section 5 Resource Requests.
Status: Funding was requested in the 2014 program review, but was not granted. No progress has been made on this plan. **See 2015 plan 6.**

B. Program Vision

What is the program's *vision* for sustaining and improving student learning and success over the next three years? Make connections to the **College Mission and Diversity Statements**, **Institutional Priorities, 2013/14-2015/16**, and other **Institutional Program Planning** as appropriate. Address discussion in the Student Learning and Program Data section: SLO assessment results and trends in student success indicators.
[**Note**: Specific plans to be implemented in the next year should be entered in C of the Planning section.
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 D1 and D2 of the Career Technical Education section.]

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 built environment to develop the creative problem solving skills and discipline knowledge needed for successful transfer and eventual professional employment in architecture, landscape architecture, interior 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. However, the 2013-14 decline in FTES is a concern. Although the program has modified course schedules to boost enrollment of both architecture majors and non-major, outreach and recruitment efforts are hampered by a lack of funding to support adjunct faculty work outside the classroom.

1. To guide future faculty and staff development initiatives, describe the professional 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 and from expanded access to supplemental instruction in pre-transfer and transfer-level math courses.

3. To guide the **Institutional Planning Budget Committee** (IPBC) in long-range planning, identify any major changes in resource needs anticipated during the next three years. Examples: faculty retirements, equipment obsolescence, space allocation.

See the Resource Requests section below to enter itemized resource requests for next year.
Leave sections blank if no major changes are anticipated.

Faculty

As a program staffed by adjunct faculty only, Architecture has an immediate and ongoing need for additional compensation at special rate for curriculum development, out-of-class activities such as design village, and ongoing communication with transfer programs. Costs have been included in both the Classified Staff and Instructional Materials portions of Section 5 Resource Requests.

Equipment and Technology

Curriculum changes at transfer schools have lead to an increased use of computer-based design tools and design-build projects. With appropriate scheduling and funding, access to computers and software can met through the drafting/CAD lab and the CIS Computer Center. The proposed tech shop in the new Center for Innovation and Emerging technologies would allow students to undertake more complex design-build projects.

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.

Classified Staff

Facilities

Improvements were made to the Architecture Studio Lab (190-114) in summer 2013, but students are still hampered by older stools, desks, and parallel bars.

C. Program 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, 2013/14-2015/16**. For each plan, list actions and measurable outcomes. (Plans may extend beyond a single year.)

2015 Plan 1: Course schedule revision to promote persistence (continued from 2014 plan 1)
To provide students with a more gradual introduction to architecture and the demands of studio

work, the major classes have been rescheduled so that students can spread their major coursework over two years while still developing a portfolio that supports transfer. In addition, Arch 100 is now offered twice a year. After fall 2015 classes are complete, enrollments will be reviewed to provide an initial assessment of the impact of these changes. This plan does not require additional resources.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Review enrollments from 2014-15 and compare with previous years to provide an initial assessment of the impact of scheduling changes.	March 2016	(Increased) persistence from Arch 120 into Arch 140; (increased) enrollment in Arch 210; (Increased) persistence from 210 into Arch 220; sufficient enrollment to offer Arch 680

2015 Plan 2: Increased use of software tools for drawing and visualization (extended from 2014 plan 2)

Increased exposure to more advanced digital graphic methodologies has become much more critical to our students' transfer success. Programs such as Maya & Rhino have become current standards at the university level for 3-d modeling and graphic communication. These tools could be incorporated into Arch 140 through guest lectures or covered in a separate course offered during the second half of the fall semester (following Arch 666). Free student or trial versions of both programs are available.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Determine best approach for incorporating more advanced digital graphic tools into the curriculum	Spring 2015	A plan for AY 2015-16 is developed.
Incorporate more advanced digital graphic tools (such as Maya and Rhino) into the curriculum.	Spring 2016	Students are able to use tools such as Maya and Rhino to support their work in Arch 220 (to be assessed after Fall 2016 offering of Arch 220).

2015 Plan 3: Institutionalization of support for Design Village (continued from 2014 plan 3)

The Architecture Club's participation in the annual Design Village event at Cal Poly San Luis Obispo in an important part of the students' professional development. Students spend much of the spring semester developing designs for a habitable structure that meets specified constraints, then make a formal presentation of their work for critique by a panel of practicing architects. The students then spend a weekend in San Luis Obispo. They and teams from colleges and universities throughout the state construct and live in the structures. The project requires many hours of student time under the supervision of the club advisor. Support for the adjunct faculty member who serves as club advisor continues to be an issue. Spring 2014 program review requests were not funded, but an Innovation Grant is supporting adjunct faculty supervision of Design Village in spring 2015 and development of a new course with lab hours clustered toward the middle and end of the term to support a design-build project such as Design Village.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Modify or develop course outlines to support an experimental course in spring 2016. and a permanent	Spring 2015	Experimental course is available Spring 2016; permanent course is in place for

course in spring 2017.		2016-17 catalog year.

2015 Plan 4: Evaluate recent CSM architecture student experience (postponed from 2014 plan 4)
To guide program development, work with PRIE to survey recent CSM architecture students to find out how they learned about the program, what worked and didn't work for them while they were taking architecture classes, and what their educational and employment outcomes have been after leaving the program. For students who left without completing the architecture major sequence, learn why they did not complete the sequence. This plan requires assistance from PRIE and from the full time faculty member in engineering.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Full time faculty member in engineering works with PRIE to develop survey questions and student list	Spring 2015	Survey is ready to administer
PRIE administers survey	Summer 2015	Survey results are available in Fall 2015
Review results of survey	Fall 2015	Review of survey results helps guide program planning for 2016-2017

2015 Plan 5: Architecture Curriculum Review (postponed from 2014 plan 5)
To promote student learning and to maintain and increase articulation with B.A. and B.Arch programs, the architecture faculty must discuss current transfer requirements and any anticipated changes with their counterparts at transfer institutions. 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. Funding was requested in the spring 2013 and 2014 program reviews, but was not granted. An Innovation Grant proposal submitted in fall 2014 was funded and is supporting adjunct faculty supervision of Design Village in spring 2015 and a more modest curriculum revision effort through fall 2015.

Action(s)	Completion Date	Measurable Outcome(s)
Consultation with transfer schools regarding articulation	Spring 2015	Gaps in articulation are identified.
Curriculum revision: Course outlines are revised or developed as needed to support articulation and incorporate knowledge gained from student surveys (see plan 4). Course sequencing is revised to promote learning and retention and support timely development of student portfolios.	Summer and Fall 2015	New and modified course outlines are submitted to COI by the 2016-17 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	Spring 2016	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.

and transfer requirements.		

2015 Plan 6: Architecture Outreach and Coordination (postponed from 2014 Plan 6)
After the curriculum review (Plan 5) 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. Adjunct faculty hours at special rate are included under instructional materials and under classified staff in Section 5 Resource Requests.

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 2016	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 2016	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 art, design, and graphics.	Spring 2016 and ongoing	Outreach activities (e.g. faculty visits to high school; high school student visits to CSM) take place. Students in Fall 2015 classes are surveyed to see if they participated in outreach efforts.

5. Resource Requests

Itemized Resource Requests

List the resources needed for ongoing program operation.

Faculty

NOTE: To make a faculty position request, complete **Full-time Faculty Position Request Form** and notify your Dean. This request is separate from the program review.

Full-time faculty requests	**Number of positions**
No full-time requests, funding at special rate is requested to support adjunct faculty work on program plans. Because there is no place to enter this request, it has been included in both Instructional Materials and Classified Staff .	

Equipment and Technology

Description	Cost
Computer for Acudemia entry of TBA hours in Architecture Studio Lab (19-114)	$0-$1000 depending on availability of older computer.

Instructional Material

Description	Cost
Adjunct faculty support at special rate (no other place to list!):	
Ongoing adjunct faculty hours at special rate for program outreach and coordination. (Plan 6; 20 hours per year)	$1400 per year

Classified Staff

Description	Cost
Adjunct faculty support at special rate (no other place to list!):	
Ongoing adjunct faculty hours at special rate for program outreach and coordination.	$1400 per year

(Plan 6; 20 hours per year)

Facilities

For immediate or routine facilities requests, submit a CSM Facility Project Request Form.

Description	Cost
New stools, desks, and parallel bars for the Architecture Studio Lab, 30 stations; price varies with model - minimum of approximately $300 per station for interim use until new building is constructed, but more durable models that could be used for many years in the new building will be closer to $1000 per station.	$9000 (less durable units for interim use prior to new construction) $30,000 (durable units for extended use in new building) Note: could be delayed and included in budget for new building.
Storage space for materials used (and reused) in larger-scale design projects such as Design Village.	small (new keys) if existing space is available
During spring semester, space for fabrication and construction of larger-scale projects such as Design Village (space for assembly of three 12'x12'x8' structures). 12-200 is being used of this purpose in Spring 2015.	small (new keys) if existing space is available

6. Program Maintenance

A. 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
No courses are due for update (last updates were completed in February 2011 for 2011-12 catalog)	Laura Demsetz	

B. Website Review

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

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Laura Demsetz	June 2015

C. SLO Assessment Contacts

Faculty contact(s)	Date of next review/update
Laura Demsetz	June 2015
