

Drafting Technology - Certificate - Full Review & SLOA

Current Compliance Year: 2023-2024

Full review

Recent Recommendations

Feedback will include recommendations from the last Expedited Review or from your most recent review by your school or college. You may not see any feedback or recommendations until you have completed your first full or mid-cycle review.

Response to Previous Recommendations (if any):

N/A

Student Learning Outcomes

The previous Student Learning Outcomes Assessment has been submitted as its own report. Going forward you will use the following prompts to discuss the success of your most recent SLOA plan and address your assessment activities since your last SLOA report (typically the past two years or since your last program review).

Learning outcomes feedback from last review: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Requires Minor Revision

Discuss your SLOA findings, changes you are making and what you hope to see as a result:

Discuss the curricular changes made based on assessing your SLO. If you haven't made any curricular changes, please explain why not and address what you did notice in the review, including strengths of your curriculum through the assessment of your outcomes:

Certificate was revamped in 2021-22 effective fall 22. Do not have enough completion data to verify any needed curriculum changes.

Are communication outcomes embedded in the SLOA Plan?

As of 2017 all Baccalaureate programs were required to embed the communication outcomes within their SLOA Plans, this is optional for non-Baccalaureate programs.

Not Embedded

Student Success

To access the Student Success Dashboard please sign into a UA computer with VPN connection (if not on campus). You will need your UA credentials and it is best accessed with the most updated version of Chrome, Edge, Firefox or Safari browsers; Internet Explorer is not supported. You will need to filter the data to see your programs. If you need assistance in finding the data for your programs, please contact your data liaison or [Julia Manfredini](#) in the PAIR office.

Data Liaisons

Each school or college has a team of Data Liaisons to help you analyze the data provided in the portal and may be able to help you see your data in multiple contexts. You can find a list of data liaisons on the resources page for Program Review.

The college or school level committee will also have access to this data with the goal that by providing these visualizations data availability will be increased.

Data supplied within the dashboard linked below is intended for Academic Program Review and not for any other purpose.

Student Success Data Dashboard

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Student Success Data Trends:

Increase in majors, No change in SCH, Increase in persistence, No change in pass rates
--

If equity gaps were found in any of your disaggregated student success data, please explain how you plan to address those gaps. Please contact your data liaison or make an appointment with [Julia Manfredini](#) to learn more about analyzing your data.

No equity gaps identified

Optional Data Explanation

Feel free to share more of your thoughts on the data provided.

The program structure was changed in 2021-22 so there is not enough data to review on the impact of the changes.
--

High Impact Practices

According to the AAC&U, High-Impact Educational Practices “have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial to college students from many backgrounds.” UAF is particularly interested in Undergraduate Research and/or Scholarly Activity because it is one of our mission fulfillment indicators, but all of these researched High-Impact Educational Practices should be reflected in your program’s student learning outcomes and curriculum.

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

High-Impact Practices Used in this Program

Please use the following fields to discuss how your program is using the high-impact practices, successes and known issues and solutions, or ways you are considering incorporating them in the future. If you are not using any of the high-impact practices listed, please use the “Other or None of These,” field to share what your program is doing to help students be successful.

High Impact Practices that currently apply to your program:

None of these

Collaborative Assignments & Projects**Undergraduate Research****Diversity/Global Learning****ePortfolios****First Year-Seminars & Experiences****Writing-Intensive Courses****Service-Learning and/or Community-based Learning****Internships****Capstone Courses & Projects****Other or None of these (explain)**

Program Profile and Financial Data

The program review elements in this section usually stay consistent for departments. Any responses you provide will be saved for your next visit. So, when it's time for the next program submission, your previous narrative profile answers will be here, ready for editing. You can then decide if any updates are necessary, based on your needs for the next program review cycle.

Financial Data Resources

The Board of Regents shapes program review, through BOR Policy 10.06, to support budget increase advocacy in the state legislature. The standardized financial data template should be analyzed with your data liaison to assess your program's capacity and resource status.

To keep integrity and remain standard across all of UAF it is very important that you do not provide any additional or alternative data.

Financial Template

Your data liaison may have uploaded your template to the Google folder for this program, or you may do so now.

Previous Feedback: Feedback and recommendations may not appear until after your first full or mid-cycle review.

Cost Effectiveness

How does your department/program approach being cost effective?

--

Program's Value to Mission

Skilled workforce: UAF's mission include educating students for active citizenship and preparing them for lifelong learning and careers. We play a key role in preparing Alaska's workforce. CTC leads the university in this effort by providing high demand job educational opportunities such as Drafting Technology.
--

Duplicative Programs

UAA has a similar program and we work with them collaboratively to provide transfer opportunities.
--

Community or Other Partnerships

Active member of the Workforce Development Committee which includes various industry partners across the state. Work closely with the committee and members to identify new and existing needs.

Value of Service Courses (Optional)

Active member of the Workforce Development Committee which includes various industry partners across the state. Work closely with the committee and members to identify new and existing needs.

Post-Graduate Success

--

Submission

Submitter & Collaborator Names

--

College or School Review Committee

The college or school committees set the tone for helping each program feel seen during this process. We have provided you with strength-based feedback tags to attach to this program review. Please select as many as applicable.

Overall Recommendations

Develop online offerings/options, Increase enrollment, Increase graduates

Explanation of Recommendations

The program is cost-effective. It should continue to work on increasing enrollment and the number of graduates.

The program should continue to explore ways to move the curriculum online as a way to reach more students.

Considering the amount of SCH generated by engineering students, the program should continue its collaboration with the College of Engineering and seek ways to support this student population further.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback (tags)

Missing a direct measure, Missing active verbs

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Feedback (narrative)

The program's SLOA plan is a good example of simplicity; however, the program should continue to work to improve this plan. Specifically, the learning outcomes statements in the program's SLOA plan should be revised to be more specific and measurable. They should state the specific technical knowledge areas and the specific drafting skills that graduates will achieve competency. For example, the demonstration of CAD Competency and Knowledge of Construction Systems (listed in the implementation column) are good examples of knowledge areas that should be listed in the Intended Outcomes column.

Profile Feedback

Program is mission-centric to UAF or college/school, Collaborative with other UA programs, "Strong service teaching component (GER, other disciplines, etc)"

Financial Feedback

Operates at Low Cost

Student Success & Equity Feedback

Certificate majors increased from five in 2019 to 14 in 2023. During this time period, AAS was suspended, the Certificate program was restructured, and an occupational endorsement was created. Program structural changes were implemented during the 2021-22 academic year, so there is not enough data to review the impact of these changes.

High-Impact Practices Feedback

The program does not use any of the high-impact practices listed in the program review report template. Although no students may have enrolled, the program should share/report in their program review the availability of the internship class within the certificate program.

Dean's Review Feedback

No feedback was recorded.

Vice Provost Feedback

Provided 1 SLO; per NWCCU guidelines, need 3-6 SLOs; will need to identify other SLOs that address measurable knowledge, skills, and abilities that would be expected for a graduate from this program to have upon degree completion; the program might consider revising the SLOs to include more “action” words(<https://tips.uark.edu/blooms-taxonomy-verb-chart/>).

Need to address closing the loop and continuous improvement.

HIPs – Provided only 1 HIP (hands-on learning with computer-aided design software; could have used more details for this practice with specific example. Not clear if these HIPs required for all students or if students can choose from a group of options. Frequency of these opportunities? Where in the program/which classes? Required or optional? What proportion of students involved?

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan 2021
Drafting Technology Certificate
Community and Technical College

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
MISSION STATEMENT: We shall provide a quality undergraduate education in drafting technology responsive to the needs of individual students, industry partners and the diverse population of Alaska. GOAL STATEMENT: To assure that our graduates are adequately prepared to succeed in the drafting industry job market in their chosen concentration area: Architectural, Civil, Info Tech, Mechanical & Electrical, Process Tech or Structural.	Students will develop technical knowledge required to perform specific drafting related duties required in a professional setting (construction office, A/E design firm, public agencies, etc.).	Student outcomes verified by drafting and technical exercises embedded within the drafting coursework. Students will complete specific exercises pertaining to drafting and construction that tests proficiency.	Faculty and program coordinator will continue to review results with industry advisory committee and employers to insure: • Completeness • Organization • CAD competency • Knowledge of relevant construction systems

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS
Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan
Drafting Technology Occupational Endorsement
Community and Technical College

Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose	Intended Objectives/Outcomes	Assessment Criteria and Procedures	Implementation (what, when, who)
MISSION STATEMENT: We shall provide a quality undergraduate education in drafting technology responsive to the needs of individual students, industry partners and the diverse population of Alaska. GOAL STATEMENT: To assure that our graduates are adequately prepared to succeed in the drafting industry job market in their chosen area of expertise: i.e. Architectural, Civil, Structural, Mechanical, Electrical, or industrial drafting related industry.	Students will develop technical knowledge required to perform specific drafting related duties required in a professional setting (construction office, A/E design firm, public agency, etc.).	Student outcomes verified by drafting and technical exercises embedded within the drafting coursework. Students will complete specific exercises pertaining to drafting and construction that tests proficiency.	Faculty and program coordinator will continue to review results with industry advisory committee and employers to insure: • Completeness • Organization • CAD competency • Knowledge of relevant construction systems

Fiscal Report for CTC Drafting Technology Department/Program

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	Definitions for the compiling staff
Total Student Credit Hours (SCH)	228	264	261	Provided in SCH tab in the student success data provided by PAIR.
Service SCH	45	42	51	Sum rows labeled as "In unit, outside department, Service" and "Outside unit, Service" in the SCH tab of the data provided by PAIR.
Department FTEs	1.38	1.06	1.12	FTE = Full-time equivalent employee. Use the worksheet below to calculate for each employee type, and then use the total from row 32 here.
Total SCH per Department FTE	164.82	249.45	232.86	
Service SCH per Department FTE	32.53	39.69	45.50	
Majors in Programs	13	11	14	Sum for all programs from the Majors Total tab in the data provided by PAIR.
Department FTEs	1.38	1.06	1.12	From row 32 below or row 5 above
Majors per Department FTE	9.4	10.4	12.5	

Total Unrestricted Expenditures				Total Expenditures made from budgets with an F1 or F7 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liaison
Total Restricted Expenditures				Total Expenditures made from budgets with revenue of the F2 or S2 fund type designation, from provided cycle report data filtered by Data Liaison
Total Unit/Central Support Allocated to Program(s)				Expenses incurred for direct support of instruction within orgs identified as central or academic support, if applicable
Tuition Revenue				Receipts to college from tuition generated by the department/program (F1). NOTE: under the current 80/20 percent tuition distribution model generating units receive 80%. These cells have a formula to calculate the tuition revenue by level (i.e. lower, upper, grad) for each fiscal year. PLEASE USE PAIR REPORTED SCH TO REPLACE ZEROES IN THESE CELL CALCULATIONS.
State Appropriation Revenue				Appropriations for current funds operation of the university from the general fund of the State of Alaska through the annual budget cycle. This category also includes TVEP and State Mental Health Trust funds, if allocated to the department. (F1)
Restricted/Sponsored Project Revenue Fees				Revenue from external sponsors; includes grants, contracts, sponsored projects & restricted (grant) accounts funded by UA Foundation funds (F2/S2) Course Fees (9159) e.g. Performance and Sales Receipts, Space Rental Revenue, Indirect Cost Recovery (F1/F7); NOTE: COURSE FEES (9159) REPORTED ABOVE. CTC Note: Reallocation of CTC revenue support through tuition and other UA receipts/revenue.
Other UA Receipts/Revenue				

Workload allocation: Teaching Units	0	0	0	Department faculty's workload units assigned to teaching
Workload allocation: Service Units	0	0	0	Department faculty's workload units assigned to service
Workload allocation: Research Units	0	0	0	Department faculty's workload units assigned to research

Full-time Equivalent Worksheet**

	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	
Faculty FTEs	0	0	0	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort assigned. F9 faculty on sabbatical count as 67% of one 9-month 0.75 FTE (or 0.50 FTE).
Adjunct FTEs	1.18	0.85	0.91	Base assumption: 40 units/credits = 1.0 FTE. Total # of credits taught by adjuncts in a year divided by 40 = the FTE of adjuncts in that year.
Staff FTEs	0.21	0.21	0.21	Base assumption: 12-month full-time = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE. 10-month = 0.83 FTE. Split appointments are multiplied by the % of effort assigned to this department. Part-time are multiplied by the % of effort.
Graduate TA/RA FTEs	0	0	0	Base assumption: 40 hours/week for 12 months = 1.0 FTE. 9-month = 0.75 FTE.
Total Departmental FTEs	1.38	1.06	1.12	Sum of all employee FTEs

****Note:** FTE definitions and calculations for the purpose of Academic Program Review are different than for other institutional reporting processes (e.g. OMB or IPEDS reporting)