



**PART 1: BASIC PROGRAM INFORMATION**

**Program Review is a self-study of your discipline. It is about documenting the plans you have for improving student success in your program and sharing that information with the college community. Through the review of and reflection on key program elements, program review and planning identifies program strengths as well as strategies necessary to improve the academic discipline, program, or service to support student success. With that in mind, please answer the following questions:**

<b>Discipline Name:</b>	Architecture
<b>Department Name:</b>	Design and Manufacturing Technologies
<b>Division Name:</b>	CTEE

**Please list all participants in this Program Review:**

Name	Position
Dennis Lutz	FT Faculty Member
Anita Talone	FT Faculty Member

<b>Number of Full Time faculty</b>	0	<b>Number of Part Time Faculty</b>	8
------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	---

**Please list the Classified positions (and their FTE) that support this discipline:**

Shared Department ADA

**What additional hourly staff support this discipline and/or department:**

None

**Discipline mission statement ([click here for information on how to create a mission statement](#)):**

In direct alignment with Palomar College’s mission statement, the Architecture Department is committed and focused on being the leading provider of education to influence positive change and excellence in the built and natural environments. We celebrate diversity in cultures, beliefs, abilities and needs. We foster a culture of integrity, professional practices, ethical behavior, environmental responsibility and global sustainability. Our instructors will educate, nurture, and inspire our creative-minded architectural and design students, immersing them in a culture of professional practices designed to evoke passion and inspiration in the pursuit of their professional goals. Our curriculum is inclusive of individuals pursuing educational enrichment, career and technical training and re-training, certificates of achievement, associate degrees, and transfer-readiness to private schools and universities. We equip students with the skills and confidence necessary to become engaging leaders of change in society while living respectfully and responsibly in a global society.

**List all degrees and certificates (e.g., AA, AT, Certificates) offered within this discipline:**

Architecture: AS Degree Major or Certificate of Achievement  
 Architectural Drafting: AS Degree Major or Certificate of Achievement  
 Eco Building Professional: Certificate of Achievement

**PART 2: Program Assessment**

The first step in completing your self-study is to examine and assess your discipline/program. To accomplish this step, complete the Following Sections:

- Section 1: Program Data and Enrollment
- Section 2: Course Success Rates
- Section 3: Institution and Program Set Course Success Rate Standards
- Section 4: Completions
- Section 5: Labor Market Information (CTE programs only)
- Section 6: Additional Qualitative Information
- Section 7: Curriculum, Scheduling, and Student Learning Outcomes

**SECTION 1: PROGRAM DATA & ENROLLMENT**

Click on the following link to examine enrollment, efficiency, and instructional FTEF trends for your discipline. Log-in using your network username and password.

<https://sharepoint2.palomar.edu/sites/IRPA/SitePages/Productivity%20Metric%20Summary.aspx>

- A. To access your discipline data, select your discipline from the drop down menu.
- B. To access course level data (e.g., COMM 100 or BIOL 100) use the drop down menus to select “discipline” and “catalog number”.

Use the data to answer the following questions.

**1. Discipline Enrollment**

Discipline Enrollment (over last 5 years)	Increased		Steady/No Change		Decreased	X
-------------------------------------------	-----------	--	------------------	--	-----------	---

**Reflect on your enrollment trends over the past five years. Was the trend expected? What factors have influenced enrollment?**

First the good news. Enrollment increased in 2016-2017 by almost 5%. This is really exciting because we were in a major downward spiral for the past four years (2012-2016) Enrollment in 2011-12 went from 646 students to 446 students in 2015-16. We lost 200 students in four years! Our student count for the department in 2012-2103 it was down 45 students. In 2013-14 enrollment was down only 6 students, and in 2014-15 it dramatically dropped 55 students. The biggest decrease was in 2015-16. Enrollment dropped nearly 100 (actual number was 94). Last year 2016-17 our student count was 470, which is up 24 students from the previous year.

There are many factors that are contributing to the decrease in the Architecture department's efficiency. Of course you can look at enrollment numbers, and cut classes with low enrollment, but that only makes the program smaller. It also sends the students to other community colleges to take the classes that have been cut. With only having one section per class, the program cannot be cutting classes that students need to finish their degrees, or certificates. Students that have hung in there with us, are taking 3, 4 even 5 years to finish because the classes are not available and they have to wait another year to take them. The deeper issue is why are the numbers decreasing?

The first and most crucial factor is that there is no full time faculty member. We lost not one, but two full time Architecture faculty members the same year. The discipline was orphaned and not supported appropriately. In Fall 2017, it will be three years the discipline has been running with no full time faculty. Without a full time instructor there is no one with passion, drive, energy, enthusiasm and a true dedication to lead the program. By running the program with all Adjunct faculty, there is no one versed in scheduling, or certificates and degrees except the counseling department. Without a full time instructor there is no one holding everything together. Adjunct instructors come to campus, teach their class and leave. Mira Costa has begun aggressively competing for our students. In fact, one of our full time instructors that left Palomar is now teaching at Mira Costa in the Architectural program and several of our excellent adjunct have joined him.

The Architecture, Interior Design and the Drafting disciplines moved to a remodeled trailer on the North side of campus (DA Building). The classroom backs up to Comet Circle. The Architecture classroom was inefficiently designed. It is poorly lighted. It is dingy, uninspiring, unprofessional looking, and messy due to lack of storage. The biggest problem is it is way too small. There is not enough space to do what the classes require. For example, the Materials class needs room to hammer together footings and frame walls. They need to mix and pour cement for foundations. They need a dedicated area where they can make noise and make messes. They are currently doing this in a very tiny space inside the classroom which is designed as a computer lab. They have supplies, projects and trash all over the classroom. Additionally, they are competing for space with the Interior Design students who also need work and storage space. We need additional workspace and storage space. We have some fabulous Adjunct instructors that cannot do what is being taught at other colleges for lack of space. Our students are not getting the whole experience that they would be getting if we had space to really teach what they need to learn.

Prior to moving to the DA building, the Architecture program occupied one main classroom and three additional shared classrooms in which to run classes. It now has one classroom, and possibly the use of the Drafting discipline rooms, if there is availability, which is rare since the Drafting program is sharing space with the new Manufacturing program. On top of that, the very same Architecture classroom is being shared with the Interior Design discipline. The Interior Design discipline has been in the Design Department (as opposed to the Trade and Industry Department), and chaired by a Nutrition instructor for the past two years. She gave it her best efforts, but the cohesiveness of the two programs fell apart. It became "us and them." The two Departments did not work well together, they ran autonomously. How did anyone think this would ever work? Scheduling is a nightmare. The Design Chair came up with the idea that all Interior Design classes should run on Monday and Wednesday, and all Architecture classes should run on Tuesday and Thursday. This is very restrictive for students. What happened is that students went to Mira Costa and to Mesa to pick up classes on the alternate days. We are losing students. Students are discouraged, confused and not having their needs met. Some of our students are running between the

three community colleges to scrap together enough classes to transfer or obtain an Architectural Drafting certificate. Some of them are just leaving.

I have been trying ever since we moved into the DA building to have the Architectural classroom re-configured and upgraded. I have been looking for an additional work space in which students can make messes and hammer nails. I also have been looking for a classroom to hold lecture-only classes that do not require computers. This would free up the current space for additional classes to be held that require computers. I met with several of our Adjunct instructors, who are Architects, on numerous occasions to see what they wanted and what needed to be done to make the space work. I asked current students what they thought of the classroom. They had great suggestions and ideas, but nothing ever happens. We are all constantly being let down after getting our hopes up. I am continuously being told to wait until a full-time instructor is hired. I am told it take Facilities months and years to get anything done. Meanwhile the classroom gets dumpier and dirtier. Time passes, students take classes elsewhere, classes are being cancelled, and the numbers get smaller and smaller.

## 2. Course-Level Enrollment and Fill Rates

**If there are particular courses that are not getting sufficient enrollment, are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment, or are not scheduled, discuss how your discipline is addressing this. For example, are there courses that should be deactivated?**

Our Fill Rate improved last year. At 89.52%, it is up almost 5% over last year and nearly what it was in 2014 (90.15%). We are about 10% lower than five years ago, but we are finally going in the right direction. We have several classes that have, in the recent years, been repetitively cancelled due to low enrollment. Our “capstone” classes ARCH215 & ARCH216 and ARCH200, an advanced level class, have been regularly cancelling. We don’t have enough students making it to the “finish line” to take these classes. We have spent the Spring semester of 2017, Summer 2017 and Fall 2017 revamping the entire Architecture program. We have examined every class in the Architecture program. We have reworded every class description so students understand them; added new classes; deactivated classes; combined curriculum for classes that were too similar; re-numbered classes so the sequence was clear to students; changed courses in our certificates and deactivated one of the certificates. We have changed the Fall/Semester offering sequence. We have published a suggested 2yr plan. We have examined other college’s curriculum and transfer requirements. We met with our Advisory Committee and examined every class and certificate. We spoke to students and our Adjunct faculty to find out what they think of our program. We have extremely busy trying to save this program. We are in the pre-launch stage of Curricunet and should be ready to go Fall 2018.

The first and most important way to resurrect the Architecture program is to hire a fabulous full time faculty member.

Next we need to use Strong Workforce money to improve and address the existing classroom design layout, functionality and lack of professional appearance. We need storage, shelving, a couple of walls taken down, lighting reconfiguration and paint. Secondly, we need a dedicated space for making messes. This could be near the existing space or even up by Facilities or the IT buildings. All that is needed are four walls, electricity, a big industrial sink and secure storage for tools and materials. Finally, we need a second classroom so Architecture and Interior Design can coexist. This could be for “lecture only” classes that do not require computers or drawing boards.

We need advertising and “ambassadors” to let potential students, high schools, trade schools, and industry know we have an excellent program and some of the best instructors in all the county. We recently scrapped the old Advisory Board and now have a contemporary, relevant and enthusiastic team dedicated to our success and excellence. We recently forged a relationship with AIA, the American Institute of Architects, for program exposure. There are so many opportunities AIA provides for students, but it is a full time job learning, participating,

implementing and forging these opportunities. I am sure none of our Architecture students even know these opportunities exist.

### 3. WSCH/FTEF

Although the college efficiency goal is 525 WSCH/FTEF or 35 FTES/FTEF, there are many factors that affect efficiency (i.e. seat count / facilities / accreditation restrictions).

<b>Discipline Efficiency Trend</b>	<b>Increased</b>	X	<b>Steady/No Change</b>		<b>Decreased</b>	
<b>Discipline Efficiency:</b>	<b>Above 525 (35 FTES/FTEF)</b>		<b>At 525 (35 FTES/FTEF)</b>		<b>Below 525 (35 FTES/FTEF)</b>	X

**Reflect on your enrollment trends over the past five years. Was the trend expected? What factors have influenced enrollment?**

Our WSCH/FTEF in 2016-17 was 396.32 compared to 307.57 in 2015-16, 314.64 in 2014-15, 359.5 in 2013-14, and 374.32 in 2012-13. In 2011-12 it was 407.82. We are not far from the best year ever in the past five years.

### 4. Instructional FTEF:

**Reflect on FTEF (Full-time, Part-time, and Overload) over the past 5 years. Discuss any noted challenges related to instructional staff resources.**

Our Hourly FTEF in 2016-17 was 3.8 and in 2015-16 it was 4.92. We had no full-time faculty these two years. For all other years it ranged from 1.87 in (14-15), 1.97 in (13-14), 1.62 in (12-13), and 1.37 in (11-12). Having it nearly double is appropriate.

We had 0.00 Overload FTEF in 2016-17 and 2015-16. For all other years it ranged from 1.13 (14-15), 0.7 (13-14) 0.7 (12-13), 1.09 (13-14) and 1.02 (11-12). This seems reasonable and steady.

Our total % of FTEF taught by Part-time faculty was 100% 2016-17 and in 2015-16 it was 98.42%. We had no full-time faculty these two years. For all other years it ranged from 53.55% in (14-15), 48.41% in (13-14), 49.93 in (12-13), and 45.00% in (11-12). Once again, full-time faculty is needed.

## SECTION 2: COURSE SUCCESS RATES

Click on the following link to review the course success rates (% A, B, C, or Credit) for your discipline. Examine the following course success rates.

- A. On-Campus Course Success Rates
- B. Online Course Success Rates
- C. Course Success Rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and special population (use the filter buttons at the top of the worksheet to disaggregate success rates by demographic variables)
- D. Course Success Rates by class location (Escondido, CPPEN, etc.)

<https://sharepoint2.palomar.edu/sites/IRPA/SitePages/Success%20and%20Retention.aspx>

## 1. Overall Success Rate:

**Reflect on your discipline's on-campus, online, and by location (ESC, CPPN, etc.) course success rates over the past five years. Compare your success rates to the overall college success rates. Are the rates where you would expect them to be? Have there been changes over time?**

Our Retention Rates for Day, Evening and Distance Education are really surprising. They are all-over the place. Last year, 2016-2017 was by far the worst year for retention in both day and evening students. Distance Ed is improving, but still under the overall average. Evening classes are our most committed students. Daytime students remain steady. If you average all the years together, Evening retention is 88.82% and daytime is 87.81%. The Overall average is 84.82%, so we are slightly above the overall average. In 2016-17 we had a lot of disgruntled students and many complaints about class schedules, time slots and classroom availability. It is very hard to complete the AS or Certificate Programs with several classes being cancelled every semester due to low enrollment. I understand we cannot run classes at a deficit, but we need to find a solution to get bodies in the seats. We also found out that some of Adjunct were encouraging students to go to Mira Costa and Mesa College. Once again, we need a full-time instructor to hold this program together, not Adjunct sending our students off to other schools.

2016-17 Day 79.90%, Evening 68.80%, Distance Ed 73.60%, Overall 75.60%

2015-16 Day 94.50%, Evening 94.40%, Distance Ed 71.40%, Overall 87.20%

2014-15 Day 86.10%, Evening 94.70%, Distance Ed 54.50%, Overall 78.70%

2013-14 Day 87.80%, Evening 90.00%, Distance Ed N/A, Overall 88.00%

2012-13 Day 86.10%, Evening 85.00%, Distance Ed N/A, Overall 86.00%

2016-12 Day 92.50%, Evening 100.0%, Distance Ed N/A, Overall 93.40%

Enrollments have improved over the last four years. Although Day students have appeared to drop, it is Distance Learning that is making it appear to be so. This is not exactly true. 2 of our 3 Architectural History classes have been put online. This is what made the daytime student count fall. Normally they would be enrolled during the day in the Architectural History classes. By going online with our History classes we are freeing up the classroom for other classes. We really need another classroom so that Architecture can run in one room and Interior Design in another five days a week. Not a 50/50 split of the week between the two Departments.

2016-17 Day 139, Evening 32, Distance Ed 182, Total 353

2015-16 Day 145, Evening 36, Distance Ed 84, Total 265

2014-15 Day 202, Evening 38, Distance Ed 88, Total 328

2013-14 Day 311, Evening 40, Distance Ed N/A, Total 351

2012-13 Day 317, Evening 40, Distance Ed N/A, Total 357

2011-12 Day 321, Evening 41, Distance Ed N/A, Total 362

## 2. Course Success Rates by gender, age, ethnicity, and special population:

**Reflect on your discipline's success rates by the given demographic variables (gender, age, ethnicity, special population). Are there large differences between groups? If so, why do you think this is happening and what might you consider in the future to address the needs of these groups?**

**Note:** Institutionally, the College has a goal to close the performance gap of disproportionately impacted students, including African-American, Hispanic/Latino, veterans, foster youth, and students with disabilities. You can access the Student Equity Plan on the SSEC website <https://www2.palomar.edu/pages/ssec/>

<p><b>Gender</b></p>	<p>Analysis of this data shows that most years, Females comprise approximately 1/3 and Males 2/3 of Architectural students. Females are below the Overall one year and the next are above the Overall; whereas, males are almost always above the Overall. Males, in general, have a 2:1 higher success rate over females. We need to find a way to appeal to the Female population. As that enrollment grows, I am sure their success rate will improve. Lately I have been reading that schools are going from STEM to STEAM. This would really boost our enrollment. I know this is happening at the High School level.</p> <p>2016-17 Female 78.60%, Male 86.40%, Overall 83.30% Females (56) - 38.89% of Enrollment v. Males (88) - 61.11% of Enrollment Females below Males and Overall. Males above Overall.</p> <p>2015-16 Female 100.0%, Male 95.00%, Overall 96.10% Females (11) - 21.57% of Enrollment v. Males (40) - 78.43% of Enrollment Females above Males and Overall. Males below Overall.</p> <p>2014-15 Female 63.20%, Male 87.70%, Overall 78.60% Females (38) - 36.89% of Enrollment v. Males (65) - 63.11% of Enrollment Females significantly below Males and Overall. Males above Overall.</p> <p>2013-14 Female 85.70%, Male 85.60%, Overall 85.60% Females (28) - 22.40% of Enrollment v. Males (97) - 77.60% of Enrollment Females and Males about even and both above Overall.</p> <p>2012-13 Female 76.90%, Male 92.50%, Overall 89.40% Females (26) - 19.70% of Enrollment v. Males (106) – 80.30% of Enrollment Females below Males and Overall. Males above Overall.</p> <p>2011-12 Female 96.80%, Male 94.70%, Overall 95.50% Females (62) – 35.23% of Enrollment v. Males (114) – 64.77% of Enrollment Females above Males and Overall. Males below Overall.</p>
<p><b>Age</b></p>	<p>After careful analysis, we found every year our largest enrollment bracket is 20-24 year olds. From 2011-14 our second largest age bracket was 19 and under. In 2014-15 and 2016-17 the second largest age bracket was 25 to 49 year olds. Our students are starting our program at a later age than in previous years. In 2016-17 and 2015-16 are highest success rates were with the 20 -24 year olds. From 2015-14 to 2011 the highest success rate flip flopped between 19 and under and 25-49 year olds. This means 4 out of 6 years the youngest and the oldest were more successful than our highest enrollment age of 20-24 year olds. Not one year did all age brackets beat the overall success rate. In years 2015-2016, 2013-14 and 2011-2012 our oldest age bracket had a 100% success rate. Never were all age brackets below the Overall, but two years 2015-16 and 2012-13, two brackets 19 and under and 20-24 year olds, fell below the Overall. Summing it up, overall our students are starting at an older age and having better success in our program. The Architecture program is difficult. It takes discipline and drive to be successful.</p> <p>2016-17            19 &amp; Under (30 Students - 16.85%) Success Rate 73.30%                           20 to 24 (82 Students - 46.07%) Success Rate 78.00%                           25-49 (66 Students - 37.08%) Success Rate 60.60%                           Overall Success Rate 70.80%</p> <p>2015-16            19 &amp; Under (11 Students - 12.50%) Success Rate 45.50%</p>

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

	<p>20 to 24 (65 Students - 73.86%) Success Rate 72.30%                  25-49 (12 Students - 13.64%) Success Rate 100%                  Overall Success Rate 72.70%</p> <p>2014-15      19 &amp; Under (21 Students - 15.79%) Success Rate 90.50%                  20 to 24 (87 Students - 65.41%) Success Rate 72.40%                  25-49 (25 Students -18.80%) Success Rate 52.00%                  Overall Success Rate 71.40%</p> <p>2013-14      19 &amp; Under (30 Students - 17.44%) Success Rate 86.70%                  20 to 24 (130 Students - 75.58%) Success Rate 87.70%                  25-49 (12 Students - 6.98%) Success Rate 100%                  Overall Success Rate 88.40%</p> <p>2012-13      19 &amp; Under (70 Students - 35.35%) Success Rate 97.10%                  20 to 24 (106 Students - 53.54%) Success Rate 83.00%                  25-49% (22 Students - 11.11%) Success Rate 81.80%                  Overall Success Rate 87.90%</p> <p>2011-12      19 &amp; Under (66 Students - 29.73%) Success Rate 93.90%                  20 to 24 (145 Students - 65.32%) Success Rate 93.10%                  25 to 49 (11 Students - 4.95%) Success Rate 100%                  Overall Success Rate 93.70%</p>
<p><b>Ethnicity</b></p>	<p>Our statistics tell us that Hispanics and Whites are approximately equally proportioned at 50/50 split of our Ethnicity. Only in 2016-17 was the ratio 2:1 with White enrollment being at 66.67%. Every year success rates of Hispanic and Whites flip-flopped from being above or below the Overall. In 2015-2016 Hispanics had a 100% success rate with Whites only being at 62.50%. That year the Overall was 81.30%. Generally speaking, both Hispanics and Whites hovered closely above or below the Overall through the years.</p> <p>2016-17      Hispanic (13 Students - 33.33%) Success Rate 53.80%                  White (26 Students – 66.67%) Success Rate 61.50%                  Overall Success Rate 59.00%</p> <p>2015-16      Hispanic (16 Students - 50.00%) Success Rate 100%                  White (16 Students - 50.00%) Success Rate 62.50%                  Overall Success Rate 81.30%</p> <p>2014-15      Hispanic (78 Students - 50.65%) Success Rate 87.20%                  White (76 Students - 49.35%) Success Rate 73.70%                  Overall Success Rate 80.50%</p> <p>2013-14      Hispanic (58 Students - 44.62%) Success Rate 82.80%                  White (72 Students - 55.38%) Success Rate 88.90%                  Overall Success Rate 86.20%</p> <p>2012-13      Hispanic (104 Students - 46.02%) Success Rate 90.40%                  White (122 Students - 53.98%) Success Rate 85.20%                  Overall Success Rate 87.60%</p>



	<p>2011-12      Hispanic (91 Students - 42.92%) Success Rate 97.80%                  White (121 Students - 57.08%) Success Rate 95.00%                  Overall Success Rate 96.20%</p>
<p><b>Special Population (examples- veteran, foster youth, etc)</b></p>	<p>Financial Aid</p> <p>Our analysis shows that approximately ½ our students received Financial Aid for the past three years. Prior to that, about 1/3 our students receive Aid. With more students than ever receiving Financial Aid, years with more students receiving Aid than those not receiving Aid, Financial Aid students had higher rates than the Overall rate. In the years where there was less Financial Aid, those that received it were below the Overall. In the years 2016-17, 2013-14 and 2011-12 those not receiving Financial Aid had a Success rate higher than the Overall. In the years 2015-16, 2014-15 and 2011-12 those receiving Financial Aid had a higher success rate than the Overall, Financial Aid recipients and those who did not receive had 50/50 success rate from 2011-2017. Having financial Aid or not does not appear to have any impact on Success Rates.</p> <p>2016-17      NO (140 Students - 49.82%) Success Rate 78.60%                  YES (141 Students - 50.18 %) Success Rate 74.50%                  Overall Success Rate 76.50%</p> <p>2015-16      NO (73 Students - 40.56%) Success Rate 78.10%                  YES (107 Students - 59.54%) Success Rate 83.20%                  Overall Success Rate 81.10%</p> <p>2014-15      NO (125 Students - 48.26%) Success Rate 72.80%                  YES (135 Students - 51.74%) Success Rate 79.10%                  Overall Success Rate %76.10</p> <p>2013-14      NO (104 Students - 39.10%) Success Rate 94.20%                  YES (162 Students - 60.90%) Success Rate 82.70%                  Overall Success Rate %87.20</p> <p>2012-13      NO (86 Students - 31.05%) Success Rate 86.00%                  YES (191 Students - 68.95%) Success Rate 89.50%                  Overall Success Rate 88.40%</p> <p>2011-12      NO (141 Students - 46.38%) Success Rate 94.30%                  YES (163 Students - 53.62%) Success Rate 92.60%                  Overall Success Rate 93.40%</p> <p>SUCCESS RATE BY TERM LOAD</p> <p>It is very interesting viewing the data to find out last year we were very close to a 50/50 split among Full-Time and Part-Time student enrollment. Usually it runs about a 70/30 split. We know that our students are going to Mira Costa and Mesa to fill their schedules in order to graduate. As pointed out earlier, we keep having to cancel classes and share the room with Interior Design. Every year our Full-Time students are above the Overall percentage. A couple of the years they just squeeze past it. For Part-Time students, other than 2016-17, they have</p>

fallen below the Overall. Three of the five years it is less than 1% below. In 2014-15 there was an enormous gap. The Overall rate was 74.70% and Part-Timers were at 59.30%. I think the lesson is that we need to get a more robust schedule, market for students and engage the ones we have in order to keep them here.

2016-17	FULL-TIME (170 Students 55.56%) Success Rate 82.40% PART-TIME (136 Students 44.44%) Success Rate 69.10% Overall Success Rate 76.50%
2015-16	FULL-TIME (130 Students 71.43%) Success Rate 86.20% PART-TIME (52 Students 28.57%) Success Rate 84.60% Overall Success Rate 85.70%
2014-15	FULL-TIME (178 Students 75.10%) Success Rate 79.80% PART-TIME (59 Students 24.90 %) Success Rate 59.30% Overall Success Rate 74.70%
2013-14	FULL-TIME (170 Students 62.50%) Success Rate 90.60% PART-TIME (102 Students 37.50%) Success Rate 90.20%

**3. Disaggregated Course Success Rates (Select at least two other variables):**

**Disciplines/programs find it useful to examine course success rates by other types of variables (e.g., time of day, level of course (basic skills, AA, Transfer). Examine course success rates disaggregated by at least two other variables and reflect on your findings.**

In the Architecture program we are very concerned about two specific demographics, Distance Learning and Transfer readiness. Our Advisory Board had a very lengthy conversation about online, or distance learning. The classes we offer online are Architectural History classes. It was very clear that students get very little out of these classes unless they are handled correctly. If they are memorizing dates and endlessly reading they are losing the beauty and majesty of actually looking at architecture that surrounds them. They lose the appreciation and the “takes my breath away” experience. We began online classes in 2014-15 with our Architectural History classes. As you can see below, we have never reached the Overall Success Rate. We started out very poorly our first year with a Success Rate of just over 50%. Now in our third year we are at almost 75% Success Rate. I think these classes need to be examined. The idea was to attract more students, but the lack of face-to-face time allows students to be disengaged, unaccountable and lacking in appreciation of the expertise and passion of the instructor, Architectural History and all of it’s beauty. Architecture is like Art, you need to see it in person to really appreciate it.

**DISTANCE LEARNING SUCCESS RATES:**

2016-17	Success Rate 73.60% Overall Success Rate 77.80%
2015-16	Success Rate 71.40% Overall Success Rate 94.50%
2014-15	Success Rate 54.50%

Overall Success Rate 87.50%

The other category that needs to be examined is transfer readiness. The reality is that every student that wants to become an Architect has to transfer. The hope is that every student is success at transferring. Over the past five years the success rate varies from 72% in 2012-13 to 77.6% in 2011-12. Three out of the past five years the success rate has been in the high 70's percentile. 2013-14 it was 76.7 and 2015-16 it was at 76.4. We are staying consistent and hoping for better numbers each year as we work on curriculum, scheduling and overall student success. There was no data available for 20116-17.

**SECTION 3: INSTITUTION AND PROGRAM SET COURSE SUCCESS RATE STANDARDS**

**ACCJC requires that colleges establish institutional and program level standards in the area of course success rates.**

**These standards represent the lowest success rate (% A, B, C, or Credit) deemed acceptable by the College. In other words, if you were to notice a drop below the rate, you would seek further information to examine why the drop occurred and strategies to address the rate.**

**Discipline Level Course Success Rate:**

- A. The College's institutional standard for course success rate is 70%.**
- B. Review your discipline's course success rates over the past five years.**
- C. Identify the minimum acceptable course success rate for your discipline. When setting this rate, consider the level of curriculum (e.g., basic skills, AA, Transfer) and other factors that influence success rates within your area. If you set your discipline standard below the College's standard, please explain why.**

<b>Standard for Discipline Course Success Rate:</b>	<b>70%</b>
<p><b>Why?</b>                  Our Architectural Program success Rate Standard is 70%. Data shows our retention rate ranges from 89.80% - 97.80% from 2011 -2106, our Success Rate for Non-Distance Learning Courses ranges from a low of 72.00% in 2016, to a high of 77.90% in 2014. These numbers are above 70%, but should be higher if our students plan on transferring and becoming successful Architects. Our Distance learning has been terrible, but is improving. The first year of Distance Learning, 2014, it was 58.60%, in 2015 it was 70.60%, and 2016 there was a dip to 68.50%. Our Distance Learning is actually harming our overall success rate of the program.</p> <p>Fall 2016                  Non-Distance Learning Courses: 72.00%                  Distance Learning Courses: 68.50%                  Total Success Rate: 70.50%</p> <p>Fall 2015                  Non-Distance Learning Courses: 76.40%                  Distance Learning Courses: 70.60%                  Total Success Rate: 75.50%</p> <p>Fall 2014</p>	

Non-Distance Learning Courses: 77.90%  
 Distance Learning Courses: 58.60%  
 Total Success Rate: 73.40%

Fall 2013

Non-Distance Learning Courses: 77.70%  
 Distance Learning Courses: N/A  
 Total Success Rate: 77.70%

Fall 2012

Non-Distance Learning Courses: 73.40%  
 Distance Learning Courses: N/A  
 Total Success Rate: 73.40%

Fall 2011

Non-Distance Learning Courses: 76.20%  
 Distance Learning Courses: N/A  
 Total Success Rate: 76.20%

**SECTION 4: COMPLETIONS**

**Click on the following link to review the completions for your discipline.**

<https://sharepoint2.palomar.edu/sites/IRPA/SitePages/Degrees%20and%20Certifications.aspx>

- A. To access your discipline data, go to the "Awards" tab at the bottom of the page and click on your discipline.**
- B. To access your program level completions, click on the tab titled "Awards by Academic Plan" at the bottom of the page and then click on your discipline.**

**1. Overall Completions:**

**Reflect on your discipline's overall completions over the past five years. Are the completions where you would expect or want them to be? What is influencing the number of completions?**

We have two avenues students can take in the architecture Program. The first being an AS degree. The AS degree was activated in 2013-14. Up to this point students received an AA degree. A Certificate in Architecture is also available in addition to the AS. These are students that are going to transfer to become Architects or Architectural Designers (less education or unlicensed). The second avenue for students is an Architectural Drafting Certificate. These Certificates are for students that want to Draft in an Architectural environment. We also have/had an Eco-Building Professional Certificate which is currently in process of being deactivated.

Our overall completions have stayed steady in the past four years ranging from 17 to 19 Certificates and or Degrees in the years 2012-16. This is actually pretty fabulous since our enrollment is drastically down and we have cancelled many classes in the past two years. In 2011-12, we had 32 Certificates and Degrees awarded; however, enrollment was almost double what it is today. In 2010-11 we awarded 1 Degree. Hopefully this is bad data, but if it is true, we are doing great now!

**2. Specific Degree/Certificate Completions:**

SPECIFIC DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES

2015-16

ARCHITECTURE AA - 0  
ARCHITECTURE AS - 2  
ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 3  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 3  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 5  
ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE - 5

2014-15

ARCHITECTURE AA - 0  
ARCHITECTURE AS - 3  
ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 3  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 2  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 5  
ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE - 3

2013-14

ARCHITECTURE AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURE AS - 5  
ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 5  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 2  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 5  
ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE - 3  
(AA degree deactivated AS activated)

2012-13

ARCHITECTURE AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURE AS - 5  
ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 5  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 1  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 3  
ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 5  
ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE - 0

2011-12

ARCHITECTURE AA - 6  
 ARCHITECTURE AS - 0  
 ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 5  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 10  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 0  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 8  
 ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE – 3

2010-11

ARCHITECTURE AA - 0  
 ARCHITECTURE AS - 0  
 ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 0  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 1  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 0  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 0  
 ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE – 0

TOTALS

ARCHITECTURE AA -10  
 ARCHITECTURE AS - 10  
 ARCHITECTURE CERTIFICATE - 21  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AA - 18  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING AS - 8  
 ARCHITECTURAL DRAFTING CERTIFICATE - 29  
 ECO-BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATE – 12

Do you have degrees or certificates with few or no completions? If so, what factors influence completions within specific programs? If you have degrees/certificates with few completions, are they still viable? What can be done to help students complete programs within your discipline?

We are a very small program right now; however students are still completing the program. Although there are not as many certificates and degree being achieved as we would like, students are attempted to finish up. I have spoken to the Adjunct instructors to speak about the Certificates and AS Degrees that are available. Students need to be continually reminded and encouraged. We are going through a huge revision of the entire Architecture Program curriculum and Degrees and Certificates. We are hoping for the roll-out to be Fall 2018. We are making them leaner and more robust. We are deactivating a few class and the Eco Professional Certificate on the advice of our Advisory Committee. They felt it was misleading for students to feel they would be able to get a job with this very small Certificate. Other schools have an entire program dedicated to Eco Building. They felt the Certificate was laughable since it was a shadow of what it should be.

Over the past three years the data looks deceiving for the AA Architectural Drafting Certificate, because it changed to a "AS" Certificate. The total of AA and AS those years was 12. All the Certificates and Degrees are remaining steady.

**SECTION 5: LABOR MARKET INFORMATION (CTE PROGRAMS ONLY)**

If you have CTE programs in your discipline, refer to the following link to obtain relevant labor market data. This data can be found on the Centers for Excellence website at <http://www.coecc.net/Supply-and-Demand.aspx>

**Example of Labor Market Information:**

SOC	Description	Counties	2014 Occupations	2017 Occupations	Change	% Change	Openings	Annual Openings	10% Hourly Earnings	Med Hourly Earnings	Entry Level Education (Typical)
13-2011	Accountants and Auditors	Imperial	341	361	20	5.8%	57	19	\$17.70	\$26.09	Bachelor's degree
13-2011	Accountants and Auditors	San Diego	12,554	13,735	1,181	9.4%	2,388	796	\$20.88	\$32.92	Bachelor's degree

**1. What is the regional three-year projected occupational growth for your program(s)?**

The Labor Market for Architectural Drafters for San Diego and Imperial Counties indicates:

2015 Jobs 1,372  
 2018 Jobs 1,451  
 2015-2018 Change 79  
 %Change 2015-2018 5.7%  
 Openings New & Replacement 131  
 Annual Openings 44

The Labor Market for Architectural Drafters for Orange and LA Counties indicates:

2015 Jobs 5,759  
 2018 Jobs 5,884  
 2015-2018 Change 125  
 %Change 2015-2018 2.2%  
 Openings New & Replacement 371  
 Annual Openings 124

**2. What is being done at the program-level to assist students with job placement and workforce preparedness?**

We are currently revamping the curriculum, course offerings, and certificates to be more relevant, concise and transferable. We are deactivating classes and the Eco Professional Certificate to make the Program leaner, more robust and relevant. We are forging relationships with Woodbury and NewSchool of Architecture to see what our students need to transfer and how to make our classes more relevant and current. We are receiving help from the AIA - Architectural Institute of America, San Diego and Palomar Chapters, to expose our students to community and professional events, organizations and companies in San Diego County. These will all lead to more jobs and better placement for our students. AIA sponsors a Career Fair once a year at Balboa Park. Palomar College has a booth at the Fair to promote our program, but better than that, the Fair has Job opportunities for students, Resume and Portfolio review and help, and Companies right here in San Diego that are hiring. We do our best to encourage all

the students to attend this Fair. We place poster around campus and in our classrooms. We e-mail all our Adjunct and ask for them to participate manning the Palomar College booth at the Fair, and to bring their students. A big thank you to John Mehnert, one of our long-time Architectural Adjunct Instructors that stepped up and took the lead for the Fair. All Adjunct were asked to participate and John was the only one to do so. He brought two students that volunteered from his class to help him man the booth. This is how fabulously dedicated our students in the program are. They worked all day for a boxed lunch. Once again without having a full- time instructor, it is hard to immerse our students in the Architectural world right here in San Diego. There are organizations, meetings, and competitions etc. happening all over the county that they could be participating in right now. There are internships and jobs that our students could be getting if we had a person who has their finger on the pulse. We have made a great contact at AIA and now someone needs to bring that wealth into the classroom. We need a Palomar College Architectural presence in the community.

**3. If your program has other program-level outcomes assessments (beyond SLOs and labor market data), including any external mandated regulatory items, discuss how that information has been used to make program changes and/or improvements.**

N/A

**4. When was your program’s last advisory meeting held? What significant information was learned from that meeting?  
(CTE programs are required by Title 5 to conduct a minimum of 1 advisory meeting each year)**

Our last Advisory Meeting was held 17 March 2017.

Our Advisory Meeting as was absolutely fabulous. We ditched the old Committee and started fresh. Joe Lucido, one of our long time Adjunct Architectural instructors, and I collaborated and came up with a phenomenal committee. Joe is a licensed, very successful Architect with many professional and educational connections in San Diego. Joe facilitated the meeting. We had representatives from NewSchool of Architecture, Woodbury School of Architecture, the CEO of AIA – American Institute of Architecture, the local Chapter President of AIA, several local Architectural Firm owners, and one of our students and our Chair at the meeting. I printed out the description and curriculum for every class and certificate in the program. Each class was discussed and many, many suggestions were made in order to improve and align ourselves better with transfer needs and industry jobs. These members really cared about Palomar’s success and the success of our students. Also Bastiaan, the CEO of AIA, had many suggestions for our students to immerse themselves in the San Diego County Architectural world. We took all this information and immediately began restructuring our Program from redoing every catalog class description to every aspect of Curriculum. When we were finished, we consulted some of our Adjunct Faculty as to when classes should be offered, sequence of classes, 2 year plans, curriculum etc. to get their options and input. Hopefully all this work will pay off. We are hoping for a Fall 2018 launch of all the changes.

**SECTION 6: ADDITIONAL QUALITATIVE INFORMATION**

**Not all information important to reviewing your program is quantitative or included in the section above.**

**Describe other data and/or information that you have considered as part of the assessment of your program. (Examples of other data and factors include, but are not limited to: external accreditation requirements, State**



**and Federal legislation, four-year institution directions, technology, equipment, budget, professional development opportunities).**

The Architectural Program is about half the size it was five years ago. Measures are being taken to rebuild the Program by revising building a fresh, enthusiastic Advisory Committee, revising Curriculum, classes and certificates, being cognoscente of scheduling at best days and hours, scheduling for maximum student enrollment etc. A lot of work has gone into saving this Program. Last year we were definitely up slightly in enrollment, success and holding steady with our Degrees and Certificates. Things are looking better. We need a Full-Time Instructor, more professional looking spaces and additional space to hold labs, lecture-only classes and a place to get “hands-on” experience.

## SECTION 7: CURRICULUM, SCHEDULING, AND STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

### 1. SLO Assessment Results:

**How have SLO assessment results impacted your planning over the last three years? Consider curriculum, teaching methodology, scheduling, department discussion (FT & PT faculty included) resources, etc. Refer to the SLO/PRP report – <https://outcomes.palomar.edu:8443/tracdat/>**

We had excellent assessment results for all of our SLO's. Overall we learned that our students have a solid grasp of architectural applications. Students in our architectural program finish with the required skills needed to be sought after employees for our community and transfer. However, we have had many discussions among a few key adjunct instructors and Advisory Members. Our students are extremely computer savvy, but cannot “talk the talk.” What this means is that the newer generations want to “show” rather than speak their ideas. This is not good for architecture. They are unable to describe and elaborate verbally on their designs and ideas. They would rather open a computer program and draft something and have you look at it. This is not good because architecture is part art, creativity, taste, form and function. We need to teach young people how to verbally communicate and express themselves.

Additionally, we have found that students taking our online History classes are not doing very well. It seems that they are just trying to get the class over with rather than learning and appreciating the history of what they do. I find this to be very disappointing. Students are not getting to see the Instructor’s passion and enthusiasm for the subject. I know these classes are encouraged because they increase our enrollment numbers, but overall they are bringing down our success rate.

### 2. SLO Assessment Methods:

**How effective are your current methods/procedures for assessing course and program student learning outcomes? What is working well and how do you know? What needs improvement and why? Refer to the SLO/PRP report – <https://outcomes.palomar.edu:8443/tracdat/>**

We believe our assessment methods are very successful. Students are assessed with every written assignment, lab, design project and exam. Their ability in the classroom directly correlates to their ability in the workplace. Again, we need to go further. It has been suggested by one of our Adjunct instructors that we make available a Palomar Sketch Book. It would be purchased by the Architectural student their very first class. Sketches, drawings, creative thoughts, discoveries and ideas will be kept in this book for every class the student takes for the entire time they are enrolled in the Palomar in the Architecture program. When they interview for a job or apply for admission to a college, this sketchbook will show their progression as a student and ability to learn and grow. Also, while revising curriculum, we have added a Portfolio as a requirement, which is a perfect assessment tool. At the conclusion of

each of our Studio classes, assessment will be by jury in order to complete/pass the class.

### 3. Program SLOs:

**How do your program SLOs represent the scope and depth of learning appropriate to the degree/certificate programs offered? What needs improvement and why? Refer to the SLO/PRP report –**

<https://outcomes.palomar.edu:8443/tracdat/>

Our SLO's are in complete alignment with Industry requirements and standards. Our students are exceptionally prepared for the workforce and transfer. We are broadening our scope of classes and software to remain one of the most current Programs available. What needs improvement is the amount of classroom space we have available to in order to offer enough classes per semester. We have a great need for more classes and are limited by classroom labs/space.

Additionally, all our curriculum and certificates are in the process of being overhauled. At the time of writing this, we are in the Pre-Launch stage. We have deactivated the Eco Building Professional Certificate on the recommendation of the Advisory Board. This Certificate is not sufficient in content or class offerings to attain a job, much less be a “professional.” The Architects at the meeting said they would never hire a student with this Certificate because it was not substantial enough. They also mentioned that other schools are have a fantastic program for what we are trying to do.

### 4. Curriculum overview:

**Does your program offer sufficient opportunities for students to learn current disciplinary and professional knowledge, skills, competencies, etc. for the type and level of degree/certificate offered? Discuss how your course/program reviews, since the last PRP, have changed and/or impacted your program. How is the potential need for program/course deactivation addressed by the department?**

Currently, our Program is not offering sufficient opportunities for our students to finish their Certificates and Degrees. We have had to cancel several classes every semester due to lack of enrollment. Sometimes if a class is cancelled, due to how far in advance schedules are made, that particular class may not be scheduled again for over a year's time. This causes the student to go to Mira Costa or Mesa College. We have been struggling with this for several semesters; however, our enrollment is up and with careful scheduling things are getting better. We hear so often, “This is the only class I need to finish.” Or, “I have been trying to take this class for five semesters.”

Also, when the school changed to a compressed schedule, all of our classes were affected because our classes are at least three hours plus long. Now because of the new schedule, by adding just a small amount of time onto every class gives us fewer slots to run classes due to the huge block of time our classes require. Our lecture and lab run together. There is not just one big lecture and several labs to choose from during the week. This is very detrimental to our Program. We can only run three to four classes in a day. The problem is magnified by the fact that we have to share the room with Interior Design. Again Architecture only runs on classes on Tuesday and Thursday and Interior Design runs on Monday Wednesday. We teach only one “all-day” class on Fridays, which is dually listed with Interior Design. We have tried running additional Architecture classes in the Drafting Program's classroom (DA3) when available on opposite days. No luck so far.

### 5. Curriculum scheduling:

**Describe how you schedule your courses to include a discussion on scaffolding (how all parts build on each other in a progressive, intentional way), and scheduling of courses so students can follow the best sequence. Address how enrollment issues impact scheduling and student completion/achievement.**

The schedule was discussed above; however, this is our greatest challenge. Part of our “overhaul” of the entire Program was to re-number classes so students understand they are a sequence. Also we deactivated a class that had repetitive content and scope to eliminate unnecessary classes. The problem with canceling our “Intro” classes is that the advanced classes do not fill due to lack of enrollment. The Architecture classes have a maximum capacity of 21 seats. If one or two students drop the beginning class how can the Advance class fill? I struggle with this dilemma every semester. If you only have one “feeder” class you need to retain 100% of the Intro students. It is almost impossible. Maybe the Intro classes should have a capacity of 24 students (there is room) and the Advanced have a lower minimum to run, around 15-18. More students could proceed with their Certificates, Degrees, and Transfer plans. This would also prevent the students from going to other Colleges.

## 6. Curriculum communication:

**How does regular communication with other departments that require your courses in their programs occur – scheduling, review scheduling conflicts/overlaps for courses within same program, etc.?**

Our courses are not required by other Programs. The architectural Program is pretty much a stand-alone, highly specialized curriculum. The only class that qualifies for this question is perhaps a student may take an Architectural History class for their Multi-Cultural requirement. This class is online so it works very well for the student.

## PART 3: Program Evaluation and Planning

**Program Evaluation and Planning is completed in two steps.**

### Section 1: Overall Evaluation of Program

Using the results of your completed assessment (See Sections 1-6 above), identify the strengths and areas for improvement within your program. Also consider the areas of opportunities and any external challenges your program faces over the next three years. Summarize the results of your assessment in the Grid below.

### Section 2: Establish Goals and Strategies for the Next Three Years

Once you have completed your overall evaluation, identify a set of goals and strategies for accomplishing your goals for this upcoming three year planning cycle. Use the template in Section 2 below to document your goals, strategies, and timelines for completion.

## SECTION 1: OVERALL EVALUATION OF PROGRAM

**1. Discuss your discipline’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in regards to curriculum, assessment, enrollment, success rates, program completion, etc. For helpful suggestions on how to complete this section, go to <http://www2.palomar.edu/pages/irp/files/2017/02/Helpful-Tips-for-Completing-a-SWOT.pdf>**

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

<p><b>Strengths:</b></p>	<p>Our greatest strength right now is our Dean. Margie Fritch is amazing and the Program is surviving because of her.</p> <p>The next greatest strength for the Architecture Program is the quality of our Adjunct Instructors. We have the best of any school. They are cutting-edge, energetic and enthusiastic. Our Instructors “walk –the-walk” and “talk-the-talk.” Since they are all Adjunct, they are out doing what they teach every day. We need to be careful they are not lured away. I know that this is happening.</p> <p>Our new and improved Advisory Committee is a great strength to our Program. Our Committee members are the real deal. We have no deadweight, out-of-touch members anymore.</p> <p>The next strength for our Program is that it has been redesigned. It is leaner, relevant and more robust. (That is as soon as it is all approved.)</p>
<p><b>Weaknesses:</b></p>	<p>Our lack of enrollment is our greatest weakness. We are up 5% from last year, which looks like a small improvement to most people, but we are up and have stopped the downward spiral.</p> <p>Again, our lack of a full-time Instructor is a major weakness. Without a full time instructor there is no one with passion, drive, energy, enthusiasm and a true dedication to lead the program. By running the program with all Adjunct faculty, there is no one versed in scheduling, or certificates and degrees except the counseling department. Without a full time instructor there is no one holding everything together.</p> <p>Our classroom/lab facility is a weakness. It is extremely unprofessional looking. It is way too small, the lighting is extremely bad, it is designed insufficiently and looks like a dump. I know it was “cleaned” over the Summer, but it remains embarrassing. We have no dedicated work area to make cement footings, hammer nails and get dirty. Storage for materials is another issue.</p> <p>Advertising and marketing are a weakness. Palomar College does generalized marketing. We have been told that the marketing available to us is the School’s Website, our Web Page, a Facebook page, and 3-Minutes of News. Next semester the Architecture Program will have an advertisement in the printed catalog. We need to pursue a much bigger audience outside of Palomar. Here are billboards advertising the school, but we need to reach students interested in Architecture.</p>
<p><b>Opportunities:</b></p>	<p>Our lack of enrollment is our greatest weakness. We are up 5% from last year, which looks like a small improvement to most people, but we are up and have stopped the downward spiral.</p> <p>Again, our lack of a full-time Instructor is a major weakness. Without a full time instructor there is no one with passion, drive, energy, enthusiasm and a true dedication to lead the program. By running the program with all Adjunct faculty, there is no one versed in scheduling, or certificates and degrees except the counseling department. Without a full time instructor there is no one holding everything together.</p> <p>Our classroom/lab facility is a weakness. It is extremely unprofessional looking. It is way too small, the lighting is extremely bad, it is designed insufficiently and looks like a dump. I know it was “cleaned” over the Summer, but it remains embarrassing. We have no dedicated work</p>

	<p>area to make cement footings, hammer nails and get dirty. Storage for materials is another issue.</p> <p>Advertising and marketing are a weakness. Palomar College does generalized marketing. We have been told that the marketing available to us is the School's Website, our Web Page, a Facebook page, and 3-Minutes of News. Next semester the Architecture Program will have an advertisement in the printed catalog. We need to pursue a much bigger audience outside of Palomar. Here are billboards advertising the school, but we need to reach students interested in Architecture.</p>
<b>Threats:</b>	<p>Low enrollment is our biggest threat. This leads to cancelled classes, and in turn, no Certificates, Degrees or Transfer. This leads to the entire Program being eliminated.</p> <p>Not having a Full-Time Instructor threatens our Program. We are a ship without a Captain. We need someone now!</p> <p>Losing our best Instructors is another threat to the Program. If an Instructor's class is cancelled, they will need to go to go somewhere else to find work. Some of our Instructors have been approached by both NewSchool of Architecture and Woodbury to come and work for them.</p> <p>Mira Costa College and Mesa College are huge threats to our Program. Mira Costa College is very close in proximity to us and they have all the "latest and greatest" because they are a wealthier school than we are. Mesa College is bigger and has more course offerings than we do.</p>

**SECTION 2: Establish Goals and Strategies for the Next Three Years**

**1. Progress on Previous Year's Goals: Please list discipline goals from the previous year's reviews and provide an update by placing an "X" the appropriate status box .**

Goal	Completed	Ongoing	No longer a goal
Move existing lighting.		x	
Lockers need to be moved, room needs redesigned for efficiency		x	
Need magnetic display boards or metal white boards.		x	

**2. New Discipline Goals: Please list all discipline goals for this three-year planning cycle (including those continued from previous planning cycle):**

<b>Goal #1</b>	
<b>Program or discipline goal</b>	Redesign and reconfigure classroom
<b>Strategies for implementation</b>	Create a design, draw plans and create a budget
<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	Now, soon or this Summer. Reliant on availability of Facilities to

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

	implement and someone to approve the plan.
<b>Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)</b>	Better environment. More professional atmosphere, More enrollment.
<b>Goal #2</b>	
<b>Program or discipline goal</b>	Find more space for program to be run meaningfully and successfully.
<b>Strategies for implementation</b>	Keep on trying to work with Facilities.
<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	Within the year.
<b>Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)</b>	A better schedule of classes and experience for students.
<b>Goal #3</b>	
<b>Program or discipline goal</b>	Hire a Full-time Instructor.
<b>Strategies for implementation</b>	Bring up enrollment and beg.
<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	ASAP
<b>Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)</b>	Everything will be better. A better student experience having someone to care about them and their goals. More community outreach more academic visibility.
<b>Goal #4</b>	
<b>Program or discipline goal</b>	Building a team and increase cohesiveness of Adjunct instructors.
<b>Strategies for implementation</b>	Share more information, goals, and plans with Adjunct. Have productive, strategizing meetings.
<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	Now
<b>Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)</b>	More enthusiasm and momentum for the Program. More Certificates, Degrees and Transfer. More of a team/department happening than individuals popping in and out for a class.
<b>Goal #5</b>	
<b>Program or discipline goal</b>	Bring up overall success rate.
<b>Strategies for implementation</b>	Work on the online classes.
<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	Next semester.
<b>Outcome(s) expected (qualitative/quantitative)</b>	More students doing better, not just "getting through it."

**3. How do your goals align with your discipline's mission statement?**

I feel these goals are directly in alignment with our Mission Statement. As our statement clearly states, we want to be the leading provider of education. We want to provide culture of excellence in teaching and professionalism with both our instruction, instructors and learning environment. We want to light the fire of passion in our students and be their inspiration.

**4. How do your goals align with the College’s Strategic Plan Goals?**

The Architecture Program’s goals of strengthening and improving student success, increasing enrollments, concentrating on retention of students, and increasing our presence in the community align perfectly with the College’s strategic goals.

**PART 4: FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP**

This section is for providing feedback.

**Confirmation of Completion by Department Chair**

<b>Department Chair</b>	Dennis C. Lutz
<b>Date</b>	Feb. 9 2018

**\*Please email your Dean to inform them that the PRP has been completed and is ready for their review**

**Reviewed by Dean**

<b>Reviewer(s)</b>	Margie Fritch
<b>Date</b>	November 17, 2017

**1. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data and analysis:**

Adjunct faculty are excellent and willing to work with the college to improve the program

**2. Areas of Concern, if any:**

No full time faculty for 3 years now, and the labs and classrooms need to be remodeled to accommodate the equipment and learning spaces needed to improve student success and learning.

**3. Recommendations for improvement:**

Remodel the labs and hire a full time instructor.

**\*Please email your VP to inform them that the PRP has been completed and is ready for their review**

**Reviewed by: Instructional Planning Council PRP Sub-Committee**

COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM REVIEW AND PLANNING

<b>Reviewer(s)</b>	Nick Vallone, Monica Galindo, Barb Kelber, Shayla Sivert
<b>Date</b>	12/11/17
<b>1. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data and analysis:</b>	
Increasing enrollments; formation of a new advisory committee	
<b>2. Areas of Concern, if any:</b>	
Online course success rates; lack of FT faculty	
<b>3. Recommendations for improvement:</b>	
Online success rates might be addressed as follows: Consider linking to Palomar's online education page, which helps students to think a little more critically about their readiness to take an online course. Also, encourage them to use online tutoring before they begin to struggle. Are your classes aligned with those in our district's high schools?	
<b>4. Recommended Next Steps:</b>	
x	<b>Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule</b>
	<b>Repeat Comprehensive Review</b>

<b>Reviewed by: Vice President</b>	
<b>Reviewer(s)</b>	Jack S. Kahn, Ph.D.
<b>Date</b>	1/14/18
<b>1. Strengths and successes of the discipline as evidenced by the data and analysis:</b>	
<p>1. The mission statement is excellent and inspirational</p> <p>2. Discipline enrollment section is well done and very thorough. I am excited about having a FT faculty member next year (crossing fingers) to help us ove this extremely important area forward.</p> <p>a. See comments of reviewers</p> <p>b. Lets work with new faculty member and dean to set a timeline for the concerns you have below- I believe having some presence at the south center will also assist us in growing the program</p> <p>c. Great inclusion of raw data and discussion of wsch/ftef etc. Smaller caps will of course limit this but you have made improvements of course.</p> <p>d. Success rate discussion is incredibly well done and hard to see any specific trends or hypotheses for change given the data- interesting – would love to try and tease this out more if it were possible</p> <p>e. Agree with comment about financial aid- that's really insightful and discussion is excellent</p> <p>f. Great discussion of De also- like face to face classes they really range in terms of what they offer-we are certainly looking to improve them- please contact our new instructional designer also for help – work with the dean if you haven't already</p> <p>g. LMI discussion is excellent as well</p> <p>h. Success rate discussion makes good sense as well as overall goals going forward</p> <p>i. SWOT is an excellent summary of where you are and yes that 5% increase is GREAT- we are going to keep moving this forward</p> <p>Really well done review with a lot of genuine analysis and clear dedication to the program.</p>	



**2. Areas of Concern, if any:**

1. Demographic data is really interesting as well- am I missing it or are just including proportions that attend (and not including success rates)? What you included is great but important to also compare success rates etc.
2. See deans comments about presentation
3. SLO section needs to take one more step- actually name the SLOS and present some data – even data trends (the majority of our students improved in X)- discussion of SLO work needed to improve is quite good
4. I understand concern with students finishing (we all have this) – I think focusing on what the program needs to do is the best part of this review since it’s a program review etc. getting a FT faculty, revising your curriculum, looking at space, sequencing etc. Great work there.

**3. Recommendations for improvement:**

**4. Recommended Next Steps:**

X	<b>Proceed as Planned on Program Review Schedule</b>
	<b>Repeat Comprehensive Review</b>

**Upon completion of PART 4, the Program Review document should be returned to discipline faculty/staff for review, then submitted to the Office of Instruction and Institutional Research and Planning for public posting. Please refer to the Program Review timeline.**