Part II: Questions Related to Strategic Initiative: Promote Student Success

Goal: SBVC will increase course success, program success, access to employment, and transfer rates by enhancing student learning.

SBVC Strategic Initiatives: Strategic Directions + Goals

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Data/Analysis 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 analysis** of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.	In addition to the meets criteria, the program **uses the achievement data** in concrete planning and **demonstrates** that it is prepared for growth.
Service Area Outcomes and/or Student Learning Outcomes and/or Program Level Outcomes	Program **has not demonstrated** that it is continuously assessing Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and/or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) based on the plans of the program since their last program efficacy. Evidence of data collection, evaluation, and reflection/feedback, and/or connection to area services is **missing or incomplete**.	Program **has demonstrated** that it has fully evaluated within a four-year cycle and is continuously assessing all Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and/or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Program Level Outcomes (PLOs).	In addition to the meets criteria, the program **demonstrates that it has fully incorporated Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) and/or Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Program Level Outcomes (PLOs) into its planning, made appropriate adjustments, and is prepared for growth**.

Student Success:

Provide an analysis of the data and narrative from the program's EMP Summary and discuss what it reveals about your program. (Use data from the Charts that address Success & Retention and Degrees and Certificates Awarded")

Our primary goal has been to update the Architecture and Environmental Design curriculum, with an emphasis on articulation and transfer, in order to facilitate student success. This has been a long and arduous process, and we are excited to report that we have made significant progress on this goal, as the courses, degree, and three new certificates were approved at Technical Review (March 4, 2019), and agendized for full committee approval on March 18, 2019. This substantive change in curriculum will go into effect Fall 2020, and we expect all of our data (enrollment, success, retention, and eventually degrees and certificates awarded) to improve considerably.

FTES in the Program have increased by 28% (2016 – 17 and 2017 – 18) compared to the low point in 2014 – 15 and 2015 – 16), however enrollment is down about 9% in 2017 – 18 compared to the previous year. In the current academic year (2018 – 19), we have offered courses required for the current degree that had not been scheduled in several years. Not having regular offerings of these courses is likely the

major reason that no degrees or certificates have been awarded in the past few years. Although we did structure a 2-year rotation of existing courses (mentioned in the EMP) to ensure that students would have access to the courses they needed, this 2-year rotation is no longer relevant now that we have completely redesigned the program. We have developed new 2-year pathways for our revised degree and three certificates, which will begin to be implemented in Fall 2020 (shown beginning on page 25). Although we are hopeful that enrollment and perhaps certificates/degrees awarded may increase a little this year, the major changes in numbers of degrees and certificates are expected to emerge within a year or two of our new curriculum becoming effective.

There are currently a number of existing ARCH courses that are out of date in Curricunet, but as mentioned, our approach this year was to completely restructure the curriculum and develop mostly new courses for the degree and three new certificates in order to achieve articulation, rather than continuing to try to update the existing courses. As such, the next academic year (2019 – 20) will be one of transition, as we only schedule courses with up-to-date curriculum (ARCH 100, 101, 145/H, 146/H, 200, and 220) and begin to prepare for the new courses, degree, and certificates effective Fall 2020. Because the development of the new courses was done with a careful eye on aligning blocks of topics in our curriculum with similar blocks at Cal Poly Pomona, we expect that we will achieve the desired extent of articulation. Most importantly, we are confident that the new arrangement of the curriculum, the updating of our degree requirements, and the introduction of the new certificates, will permit our students to more easily and more efficiently transfer to four-year institutions and secure employment in Architecture and related fields.

In evaluating retention and success data over the 5 years of this reporting period (2013 – 2018), retention has remained fairly consistent with an average of 89%, which is acceptable. Average success over this same period, averaged 67%, with much greater variation than that seen with retention. Success also experienced a sharp decline from 71% (2016 – 18) to 63% (2017 – 18). We believe that the transition from Blackboard to Canvas played a major role, as in many of the face-to-face courses, as well as obviously the online ones, the learning management system is used extensively. Canvas turns out to be a much more demanding system and has greater limitations than does Blackboard in the design, presentation, and use of many of the ARCH courses. Many of the quizzes and activities that were successful in Blackboard had to be redesigned and could not utilize the same variety of learning styles that were available in the past. Furthermore, our experience was that students had an adjustment period, getting used to the new software as well. We are hopeful that as our knowledge of Canvas expands, we are able to restore the same features of our online components that we had with Blackboard, and that the students' interaction with and navigation of Canvas improves as they become more accustomed to it.

During this next year of transition, we will actively direct new students to take ARCH 100 and 145 in Fall 2019, and ARCH 101 and 146 in Spring 2020. The history classes will remain in the new curriculum. ARCH 100 and 101 have been restructured. Students who take ARCH 100 and 101 will be able to petition to have these courses accepted, so as not to harm their progress. We believe that the new focused curriculum with the emphasis on articulation and transfer for the degree, and modern computer-based drawing and modeling for the certificates, forms a solid foundation for our students to succeed. Importantly, we have developed a work study course (ARCH 098) as part of the new curriculum that will provide an important link between the learning in the classroom and laboratory, and the expectations of working in the industry. Besides contributing to the skills that students acquire, this opportunity will increase the connections of our students and our program with local businesses.

We have also been successful in the goal of securing much needed funding for the Program in the most recent Needs Assessment cycle (Fall 2018). We were awarded funding to purchase a class set of software licenses needed for our computer-based drawing and modeling courses and projects, and this purchase of Rhino software is underway right now. The other two software programs required are available at no charge from the developer and we have the most current version in our lab. By the end of this semester, all of our software will be up to date, which will undoubtedly contribute to student success and relevance in their

training. We were also awarded an appropriate budget for this year, which will permit the purchase of supply kits, rather than the instructor spending out-of-pocket money to assist students. Having proper supplies in the lab is critical for the experiential portion of the ARCH laboratory, and we will continue to work to ensure that the budget becomes permanent.

Supplemental Data:

Provide any additional information, such as job market indicators, standards in the field or licensure rates that would help the committee to better understand how your program contributes to the success of your students.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017 data) annual mean wage and employment opportunities for architects (excluding landscape architects):

California: $97,440 (0.83 per thousand jobs)

Riverside-San Bernardino-Ontario: $91,310 (0.35 per thousand jobs)

Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale $98,300 (0.97 per thousand jobs: third highest metro area nationwide)

According to these data, employment in our immediate area is a little low; however, the Los Angeles area is the 3rd highest metro area, nationwide, and California has the highest state level of employment of architects. There are job opportunities in the broader area and the fields of Architecture, Environmental Design, and allied areas are meaningful educational and career paths. It is important that our students have access to updated technology, work study opportunities, efficient pathways for transfer, and out of class experiences (described in Campus Climate and Partnerships), so that they can be competitive seeking employment upon leaving Valley College or their transfer institution.

https://www.bls.gov/ooh/architecture-and-engineering/architects.htm

https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes171011.htm#st

(INSERT SLO and/or SAO and PLO DATA as appropriate FROM CURRENT REPORT. INSERT COURSE MAP IF AVAILABLE. Refer to prior reports as needed for the analysis.) (Contact Dr. Celia Huston, Co-Chair, Accreditation Committee, at chuston@valley.edu if you need assistance.) **NOTE: Do NOT include the summaries of the outcomes in this document.**

Student Learning Outcomes:

Course SLOs/SAOs. Demonstrate that your program is continuously assessing Course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs). Include evidence of data collection, evaluation, and reflection/feedback, and describe how the SLOs/SAOs are being used to improve student learning (e.g., faculty discussions, SLO revisions, assessments, etc.). Generate reports from the Cloud as necessary. Include analysis of SLO/SAO Cloud reports and data from summary reports. This section is required for all programs.

The table on the next page shows the SLO course data collected since Fall 2015. Discussion about some disaggregated data follows.

Term	Course	SLO 1	SLO 2	SLO 3
Summer 2018	145	94.44 %	94.12 %	
	146	100.00 %	100.00 %	86.67 %
Fall 2018	100	93.33 %	93.33 %	80.00 %
	101	71.43 %	71.43 %	
	120	82.35%	82.35 %	
	145	100 %	100 %	
	146	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported
	250	87.50 %	87.50 %	
	270	100 %		
Spring 2018	100	100%	100%	100%
	101	Not reported		
	120	100 %.	100 %	
	145	Not reported	Not reported	
	146	Not reported	Not reported	
		Not reported	Not reported	
	200	80.00 %	80.00 %	80.00 %
	201	66.67%	66.67%	66.67 %
Summer 2017	145	94.44 %	94.12 %	
	146	100.00 %	100.00%	86.67 %
Fall 2017	100	Not reported		
	101	Not reported		
	120	Not reported		
	145	100 %	100 %	
	146	Not reported		
	220	60%	80%	60%
	221	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00%
Spring 2017	100	100 %	100 %	90.91 %
	101	100%	90.91 %	
	120	Not Reported		
	145	95 %	100 %	
	146	84.00 %	83.33 %	100 %
	200	62.50 %	83.33 %	83.33 %
	220	50.00 %	50.00 %	50.00 %
Summer 2016	145	Not reported		
	146	Not reported		
Fall 2016	100	91.67 %	95.83%	91.67 %
	101	100.00%	100.00 %	
	120	93.33 %	86.67 %	
	145	96.43 %	74.19 %	
	146	90.70 %	83.72 %	83.72%
Spring 2016	100	100.00 %	94.12 %	100.00 %
	120	100.00%	100.00 %	
	145	93.33 %		
	146	Not reported		
Summer 2015	145	Not reported		
Fall 2015	100	93.33 %	78.95 %	92.31 %
	101	100.00%	83.33 %	
	120	86.67 %	80.00 %	
	145	100.00%	88.24 %	
	146	89.47%	96.77 %	96.88 %

SLO Disaggregation.

Face-to-Face vs. Online.

ARCH Courses	Face-to-Face	Online
All Courses	89%	92%
ARCH 145	93%	94%
ARCH 146	92%	90%

ARCH 145 and 146 represent the only online offerings, and the data show the SLO success for those specific courses (face-to-face vs. online) is within 2 percentage points, which is acceptable. For all courses, the difference between these two formats is 3 percentage points. This shows that our online formats are equally effective as their face-to-face counterparts. Significant effort and planning have gone into the creation, maintenance, and improvement of the online courses over several years to result in a quality system. The recent transition from Blackboard to Canvas was turbulent, and required dozens of hours to convert and re-create course content and delivery (most course elements did not transfer smoothly to the new learning management system). While we experienced some challenges from this transition in the online environment, the SLOs that were evaluated seemed to maintain their historic levels of success.

Lower-Level vs. Upper-Level.

ARCH Courses	SLO Success	# Students Evaluated
All Courses	89%	418
100-level	92%	359
200/201	76%	40
220/221	54%	19

SLO success shows a decline going from 100-level courses (ARCH 100/101/120/145/146) to 200-level courses. Several factors may be contributing to this effect.

The number of students evaluated in the 200-level courses is substantially lower than in the 100-level courses. Lower enrollment meant the courses hadn't been offered as frequently as they should have been (because the classes couldn't fill). As such, some students experienced a large gap in time between the introductory and advanced courses (i.e., between ARCH 100/101 and ARCH 200/201, or between ARCH 120 and ARCH 220/221). As we know is often the case, when too much time elapses between sequential courses, students often struggle in the later course.

Compounding this problem, is that in order to offer the 200-level classes, we were directed to stack those with similar content as an attempt to achieve a higher fill rate, otherwise the classes could not be offered. For example, ARCH 200 and 201 were offered in a stacked format (same place, same time, same instructor), as were ARCH 220 and 221. Although great care was taken to ensure that the integrity of instruction was not compromised, in each case these were nonetheless two separate courses being offered at the same time. In other words, one instructor had to navigate two syllabi, two sets of students, two course outlines of record, and two sets of assignments in every class meeting. This was not only a strain on the instructor, but it is far from an optimal class environment, diluting the focus that an instructor owes to a particular class. The college prohibited the practice of "stacking" last year, so this particular problem is now resolved moving forward.

As mentioned in several places in this document, the 2019 – 2020 year will be one of transition for our course offerings, as the final year of our existing curriculum (new curriculum goes into effect Fall 2020). As such, ARCH 201 and 221 will not be offered, as they are currently not updated in Curricunet; only ARCH 200 and ARCH 220 are possible upper-level classes for next year. It will be interesting to compare SLO data for these classes in an unstacked format to previous years in a stacked format.

Moving forward, the most critical solution to this problem is to schedule the sequential courses in a predictable and advertised rotation. We have proposed 2-year pathways for our new courses, degree, and certificates (beginning on p. 25), which will be implemented in Fall 2020. In addition, we will hold departmental discussions over the next year, regarding SLO assessment methods for our new courses.

Program Level Outcomes:

If your program offers a degree or certificate, describe how the program level outcomes are being used to improve student learning at the program level (e.g., faculty discussions, SLO revisions, assessments, etc.). **Describe** how this set of data is being evaluated or is planned to be evaluated. Generate reports from the SLO Cloud as necessary. Include analysis of SLO Cloud reports and data from 4-year summary reports. If your program does not offer a degree or certificate, this section is optional (but encouraged).

Certificates.

The current certificate (Computer-Aided Drafting Technician) does not have PLOs, thus they have not been evaluated. The PLOs submitted for our new certificates are listed below. As we work to transition into the new curriculum over the next academic year, we will begin departmental discussions to determine the assessment tools to best measure and evaluate these PLOs beginning Fall 2020.

3D Modeling and Design Certificate *New Certificate*

1. Read and interpret blueprints, design documents, and project specifications to gain meaningful information.
2. Compare and contrast the conventional drawing types and views and explain the advantages of each.
3. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of basic drawings utilizing industry conventions of scale, scale, line, symbols, lettering and dimensioning techniques.
4. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of drawings utilizing three-dimensional modeling and design techniques.

Building Information Management (BIM) Certificate *New Certificate*

1. Read and interpret blueprints, design documents, and project specifications to gain meaningful information.
2. Compare and contrast the conventional drawing types and views and explain the advantages of each.
3. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of basic drawings utilizing industry conventions of scale, scale, line, symbols, lettering and dimensioning techniques.
4. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of drawings utilizing Building Information
5. Management and modeling techniques.

Building Information and 3D Modeling Certificate *New Certificate*

1. Read and interpret blueprints, design documents, and project specifications to gain meaningful information.
2. Compare and contrast the conventional drawing types and views and explain the advantages of each.

3. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of basic drawings utilizing industry conventions of scale, scale, line, symbols, lettering and dimensioning techniques.
4. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of drawings utilizing Building Information Management and modeling techniques.
5. Demonstrate the ability to mechanically construct a variety of drawings utilizing three-dimensional modeling and design techniques.

Degree.

Over the past 3 years, between 496 and 686 students have been assessed for the PLOs for the degree, with success ranging from 84.48% to 87.32%. Both indicators are acceptable, which indicate that students can successfully express their knowledge with verbal, written, and graphical techniques, develop and present two- and three-dimensional design solutions in projects, and relate various influences to architectural styles. These outcomes capture the core skills that students must possess as they transfer to upper-level courses at the 4-year institution, or move into the workforce. There are no plans to modify the PLOs over the next academic year.

For the new degree, we are retaining the existing PLOs, but adding one for students to demonstrate an awareness of relationships among allied fields. Upon exiting the program, students should be able to see the connections amongst the different but related fields of Architecture, Environmental Design, Urban Planning, and Computer-Based Design. By recognizing the cross-over skills, a wider range of job opportunities will likely be available as students move on to utilize their degree or certificate.

Even though our PLOs indicate successful achievement, we will engage in discussions to determine if the assessment methods should remain unchanged, or if the launching of the new curriculum affords an opportunity to modify and perhaps streamline these methods.

Part III: Questions Related to Strategic Initiative: Improve Communication, Culture & Climate

Goal: SBVC will promote a collegial campus culture with open line of communication between all stakeholder groups on and off-campus.

SBVC Strategic Initiatives: Strategic Directions + Goals

	Does Not Meet	Meets	Exceeds
Communication	The program **does not identify** data that demonstrates communication with college and community.	The program **identifies** data that demonstrates communication with college and community.	In addition to the meets criteria, the program **demonstrates** the ability to communicate more widely and effectively, **describes** plans for extending communication, and provides data or research that **demonstrates** the need for additional resources.
Culture & Climate	The program **does not identify** its impact on culture and climate or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.	The program **identifies and describes** its impact on culture and climate. Program **addresses** how this impacts planning.	In addition to the meets criteria, the program provides data or research that **demonstrates** the need for additional resources.