The Architecture program enrollment data indicates that the department is doing more with less. Looking at the number of students versus the number of sections in 2010/11 there were 15.25 students per section, in 2011/12 there were 15.6 students per section, while in 2012/13 there were 17.7 students per section. There were more students & sections in 11/12 because some of our night classes were combined to meet the 20 student threshold. This may have been due to the slow economy & students returning to be retrained on the latest CAD software.

The recent decrease in sections is due to low enrollment in some of the night classes. This could be due to the improving economy where people are returning to work instead of retraining. In a recent meeting with our advisory board we learned architecture firms are hiring again after a long period of contraction. The number of students per section causes some combined classes. This occurs primarily with the more advanced courses as students leave for employment or transfer to upper division schools.

The Architecture program is still a traditionally male-oriented occupation; however our female population was consistent thru 2010-2012. There shows a slight reduction in female students in 2012-13. This may be due to the discontinuance of the interior design program in that one of our courses was required as a part of their program. (Some of the interior design courses have just been transferred to our program but are not now being offered.)

The Architecture program enrollment data reflect that the student population that we serve is very diverse and mirrors that in the local community. The number of Latino students has grown by 8% from 2010/11, while the number of White students has decreased 9% from 2010/11.

The faculty in the Architecture works to meet the needs of a diverse student body while maintaining a high academic standard for the students. Average student success and retention rates in the Architecture program remained relatively stable or improved. Overall retention rates increased slightly. They were 83% in 2010-2011, 85% in 2011-2012 and were 88% in 2012-2013. This compares with a college wide overall retention rate of 78%. Overall success rates are good. They were 65% in 2010-2011 and were 69% in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. This compares with a college wide overall success rate of 63%.

The improvements may be due in part to improved content delivery. Faculty has worked hard to convert course content to an electronic format. The purchase of second monitors for each student workstation allows the students to have lessons and examples available at their desks at any time. There has also been an increase in certificates achieved. There were 8 certificates in 2010-2011, 5 in 2011-2012 and 17 in 2012-2013. There also is an up-tick in students obtaining employment. This may be due to the improving economy and our new building information management (BIM) courses.

The Architecture program and Drafting program have 2 full-time faculty and 5 adjunct faculty who teach at the LAC campus. All faculty bring expertise and commitment to their teaching (which is reflected in student success rates). In addition, full-time faculty act as ongoing mentors for adjunct faculty members. The drafting program has one classified position. One full-time faculty member & one adjunct faculty teach solely architecture courses. One other full-time faculty member teaches one architecture course while the rest are drafting courses. The remaining adjunct faculty members solely teach drafting courses although one can teach in each area. We currently are reviewing applications for a full time position for the drafting program. In the last year we have lost an adjunct faculty member in each area. This has impacted the number of sections offered. The hiring of one more full-time faculty will allow for more sections and assist in the collection of data and assessment of SLO’s.

Not all of the Architecture program courses have been reviewed yet. Two of our 8 unit block classes have been reviewed in 2012. These are the intermediate level (Archt 64) and the advanced level (Archt 70). Their counterpart 4 unit night courses (Archt 65 & 66 and Archt 71AD) have been reviewed as well. The beginning level 8 unit course (Archt 60) and its counterpart 4 unit night courses (Archt 61 & 62) are scheduled to be reviewed in 2015. In hindsight the beginning courses should have been done first.

SLO’s are clearly stated in each course syllabi. Each instructor is responsible for collecting and evaluating data. Department standardized rubrics are used as measuring tools.

After the review of the SLOs and use of the rubrics faculty have identified several areas requiring improvement at the course level. For instance, some SLOs are too vague and some are too large to be assessable. We hope to address these issues this semester.

Our advisory board meeting was very recent (on November 14th). We have yet to compile the results of a survey the members completed on the direction of the program. The discussion at the meeting involved possibly taking the Architecture program in a new direction in that the historic delivery of architectural information is changing. This may greatly affect the current course level SLOs.

The SLOs for all courses appears on the syllabus of each class. Each faculty member is responsible for evaluating SLO results for his/her course and determining the appropriate course of action for improvement. Program faculty members convene to discuss the improvements. A summary of some of the actions that faculty members are taking are as follows: When the expected SLO outcome was not met, faculty members will try different approaches to enhance student learning. Lectures and/or assignments will be modified; more class time will be dedicated to particular topics to allow students to
review difficult concepts. Faculty members will continue to monitor students during subsequent semesters. Since there is only 1 Full Time instructor and 1 Part Time instructor, gathering the data is not a problem. Finding the time to evaluate the results is the main problem.

PR 3C - SLO - action/ change based on results:
The faculty has learned the SLO process is a way to improve the program. Feedback from the results of the assessments has resulted in improvements in teaching. New assignments for have been created for topics students showed difficulty mastering, for example; the creation of CAD text & dimension styles. We learned some of our SLOs were not assessable and need to be rewritten or modified. We also learned the 3 level rubric should be changed to 4 - 5 level to provide a greater range in assessing the student work and some topics may be better assessed with a performance test.

The change in the preparation and delivery method of architectural work recently indicated by our advisory board may significantly alter our existing SLOs and their assessment method to align with industry trends.

PR 4A - Goals - development and change:
The Drafting department staff has worked hard over the past three years to fulfill our multi-fold mission of 1) transfer preparation, 2) preparing students to attain an associate degree & 3) gaining employment in a related field. We have had some success in completing some of our recent goals. Our goals have been designed to promote student success in support of LBCC’s Educational Master Plan, the President’s Agenda and the Board of Trustees college goals.

Over the last three years we have achieved some of our “physical plant” goals such as; Room B-303 was returned to the Drafting department’s inventory of usable rooms. Purchased 2 new HDMI projectors with VTEA money to expand and modernize B-302 & B-303. Purchased 32 additional monitors with VETA money for students in B-300 to use as a "PDF/Reading monitor."

We have run a non-credit short term “portfolio class” thru our Architecture club to assist with transfer preparation. We are interested in creating a permanent “portfolio” course.

The department faculty worked closely with the Long Beach Unified School District, LBUSD, to create a career path from high school to LBCC to obtain an associate degree thru a “credit by exam process”. An online exam was created for credit by exam for ARCHT 60 giving the students 8 units of credit, which allows them to enroll directly in our intermediate course ARCHT 64. This agreement needs to be renewed for the next year.

Feedback from our advisory board at our November 14th meeting indicates the profession is undergoing a fundamental change in how Architectural work is being delivered. It is moving toward a process of building information modeling (BIM). The department was aware of this and had already created a series of three new courses specifically for this transformation. The new method of developing architectural work will spread to all architectural courses. This will aid our students in gaining employment. This will also cause us to re-think our course SLOs. We will need to find funding for training of existing faculty in BIM software.

We got approval and are currently in the process of hiring another full time faculty member in the mechanical drafting department. We hope to be able to hire one more full time faculty member that can teach in either of our programs.

PR 4B - Goals - results:
Manny of our recent goals have been met as mentioned above.
We will be analyzing data from a survey of our advisory board members before the end of the term. We will look to implement their suggestions for the program in the near future. The new method of developing architectural work will spread to all architectural courses.
We will be contacting LBUSD to arrange meetings with them to renew the credit by exam agreement.
We will be making an application to hire one more full time faculty for the drafting programs.

PR 4C - Goals - future plans:
We are actively using our data collected from SLO's to consistently improve instruction. We should see some indication of that in the next assessment. Some of the SLOs as written need revising.
As we transition to the process of BIM into some of our other classes we will need to reassess and rewrite the existing course SLOs for those classes. We would like to offer a portfolio course to assist students to prepare for transfer and achieve advanced placement at an upper division school.

Projects/ Strategies and Resources Needed