Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2015

Name of Department: Architecture

Efficacy Team: Diane Dusick, Stacy Meyer, Joel Lamore

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Continuance

> **The Architecture program is experiencing a period of change and adaptation. Courses are being redesigned and challenges, both internal and external, are being addressed. The program did a good job evaluating itself in most areas, though in general more precise data could have been employed to accompany more robust analysis. The program is rebuilding, but seems focused and improving. Two areas were Does Not Meets: Student Learning Outcomes and Trends. In the SLO area, the program did not include their PLOs or the PLO grid. In addition, the discussion of SLOs and Core Competencies was not satisfactory. In the Trends area, only job/career trends were identified, and there was little planning discussion on what the program was doing in response. Many trends, both internal and external, affect a program like Architecture, and the lack of tracking on at least a few of the more important ones outside job/career outlook is a significant deficit.**

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
Part I: Access		
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*The program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.* *If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program has adequate coverage and analysis of demographic data. However, the program could provide more info on how the program plans to boost female participation. In addition, it would have been useful to have discussed more specific comparison between program and industry to better quantify that the industry is "male dominated" and perhaps how the program favorably compares.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.* *If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program describes its pattern of service well, acknowledging its shortfalls. Some plans to address those were including in the analysis. The program should also discuss whether the pattern of service may partially account for the drop in FTES and WSCH per FTEF, as budget cuts may not wholly explain the drop. In discussing some program challenges as related to the obstacles students face, some hard data about current student population would have been useful to strengthen the analysis.

Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	*Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.*	*Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program discusses EMP data on retention and success. Retention is relatively high, but the success rate peaked at 79% in 11-12 and declined to 65% in 13-14. There is a plan to address the need to offer the advanced classes to increase the number of certificates. In the supplemental data area, they indicate the major is impacted at the 4-year level, but do not provide data to support.

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	*Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*	*Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET

The program has SLOs and has evaluated them for most classes, and there is some discussion about how SLO data has been used to improve courses. However, the Program SLO grid is missing. Given that a good deal of the curriculum is being reworked, PLOs may be awaiting that work to be closer to completion. However, the discussion in the PLO section does not address PLOs directly at all. The SLO/Core Competency grid is present but analysis only covers CCs aligning with college list of CCs while the main issue in this section is how the CCs in conjunction with SLOs have impacted courses and the program. While some of the discussion from SLO area in this section overlaps, some more relevant discussion is needed on SLOs and CC relationship.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	*The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.*	*The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The Architecture program has a mission statement and it aligns with the college mission. The department mission statement, however, is buried a bit in the discussion and could have been more clearly set off.

Productivity	*The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.*	*The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The lower efficiency of the program is discussed and explained by noting class size limitations and supervision of labs. However, since efficiency was higher some years back, the committee wondered whether the explanations are sufficiently comprehensive. Other evidence bearing on productivity, such as regulatory compliance, response time, and student satisfaction was also developed.

Relevance, Currency, Articulation	*The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.* *Out of date course(s) that are not launched into CurricuNet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.*	*The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

Though there are some courses overdue for content review, they are being addressed. The program included a discussion of articulation for transfer. However, the issue of the need for students to have a portfolio for successful transfer (mentioned elsewhere in the document as well) is not discussed, so it is unclear if there is a plan to remedy this (or if this is already solved). The currency area has some off-point discussion, but currency is otherwise well covered.

Part IV: Planning		
Trends	*The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.*	*The program identifies and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: DOES NOT MEET

The program included two government statistic documents regarding job and career outlook for architecture. However, the discussion of planning after documents is a mere four point list. This is inadequate discussion of job trends and impact on program. In addition, there must be other trends that will impact program: budget, enrollment patterns, transfer issues, pedagogical change, technology, regulatory change, etc. None of these are mentioned or analyzed.

Accomplishments	*The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.*	*The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program's list of accomplishments is filled out well for the most part, but there were a few gaps: the number of students accepted for transfer, for instance. Also, the claim that students are successful at transfer institutions is unsupported with even simple numbers. The program mentions special topic opportunities, but does not explain what those are.

Weaknesses/challenges	*The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.*	*The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program's examination of challenges hits clear issues and lays out plans, though some of the items would benefit by more explanation. Some important challenges, work experience to address shortcoming in drafting and studio space deficits, get the most discussion. However, explanations of the challenge of hybrid courses and degree barriers are somewhat vague.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*
	Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.	*Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: MEETS

The program discusses each area. The explanations of Partnerships and Campus Climate are the most thorough, with multiple examples listed and some level of detail. The Technology area, which arguable should have the most impact on the program, lists two items with little detail. Nonetheless, generally good coverage of this area.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.	*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no "Does not Meets" in the previous efficacy review): MEETS

Though program did not have previous Does Not Meets, it should have specifically noted that per instructions from Program Review chair.