

Date: February 2, 2020

To: John Stalvey, Interim Provost

From: Denise Runge, Dean

Re: AY20 Expedited Program Review Findings

Program/s in this review: Architectural & Engineering Technology (AAS)

Specialized accrediting agency (if applicable): none

Campuses where the program is delivered: Anchorage

Members of the program review committee:

- Joel Condon, Director
- Brian Bennett, Professor
- Darryl Jordan, Assistant Professor

Centrality of Program Mission and Supporting Role The program aligns fairly well with the mission of both the CTC and UAA. The program prepares its graduates to either seek immediate employment in architectural or construction firms, or to continue on for a degree in Architecture out of state. The program plays an important supporting role for the AAS and the BS in Construction Management. AET courses comprise 16 of the required credits for these CM degrees.

Program Demand (including service to other programs), Efficiency, and Productivity

Demand for the program had declined previously, leading to suspension and dramatic restructuring; the revised program has attracted a small number of new applicants in its first year, and experienced changes that are leading to lower costs. As the program notes, the state experiences nearly 60 openings for Architects per year, which is evidence of a potential demand for the program.

During the review period, the number of majors declined from 78 in 2013 to just 16 in 2019 during the teach-out of its previous version. The hope was that the revisions will allow it to become more efficient and productive if enrollment rebounds to levels seen in the early 2010s. In 2019 the program realized only \$181.5 tuition dollars per SCH at a cost of \$375.6 for a ratio of 48.3%, only slightly better than its ratio of 41.3% in 2015. However, as noted when the program sought approval to re-emerge from Suspension, it now uses mostly courses which are also taken by students in other programs such as Construction Management and Art. Furthermore, the program previously had two full time faculty plus some adjuncts, but one has since retired and was not replaced, and the CM faculty now teach a few of the AET courses. Overall the program evidences excess or unused capacity, and relatively high costs.

Program Quality, Improvement and Student Success Quality will be difficult to assess until the program has several years' worth of data. Previously the program did have success in placing graduates, but as noted in the report the type of career opportunities formerly offered are generally no longer available. It is noteworthy that 70% of the (former) program's graduates did go on to enroll in additional post-secondary education. Recent improvement efforts, especially those centered around student success, have the potential to positively impact the program. The average number of AET graduates hovers around nine per year, and historically the majority of AET students have taken between three and five years to complete their degrees. Additionally, the average number of credits per degree had declined, down to 67 per student from a high of 96 in 2016.

Program Duplication / Distinctiveness Duplication: both UAS and UAF offer similar programs. Distinctiveness: UAA's program is distinctive, due to its increased focus on the creative process, problem-solving, and the potential to articulate to an Architecture program.

Commendations and Recommendations *Commendations:* The program is commended for incorporating industry feedback into its recent curricular revisions. The program is further commended for utilizing existing UAA courses to the extent possible in the revision, rather than creating new or stand-alone courses. *Recommendations:* The program should engage in efforts to recruit students, particularly those from secondary schools that offer drafting or construction programs. The program should continue to use existing courses and faculty from related programs to keep costs low. The program should work with Institutional Research to try to understand the post-award enrollment patterns of its students. Finally, the program should proactively monitor the progress of enrolled students and offer support as needed to ensure they can complete their degrees.

Decision *Continued Review:* the program is required to address specific issues and to undergo another review within the next two academic years.