**

**CE Workshop Evaluation Form**

**Arrangement and Description Track**

Workshop **Evaluation Form:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title**  | **Managing Architectural, Design, and Construction Records** |
| **Reviewer:** | James Roth |

Directions:

* Quantitative: Each item below begins with a **bolded** statement. Score each with a 1-5 ranking to indicate your assessment of the veracity of that statement based on your review of workshop overviews/agendas, evaluations, and other materials.
* Qualitative: In the comments section for each item below, please respond to the additional questions posed and any related issues that this workshop raises for you.
* Provide any additional assessments or comments not relevant to one of the specific, numbered areas in the space provided following the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Please place an “x” in the appropriate column, use* ***1=low****, undesirable, to* ***5=high****, excellent.* | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Does the content **appeal to its specified audience**? Does it indicate specific categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise to assist potential participants in determining the workshop's relevance for them?Comments: Yes, has some appeal to specified audience: Archivists, town clerks, curators, librarians, |  |  |  |  | X |
| 2. To what extent does the subject matter **reflect current archival practices** and theory commonly accepted in the profession?Comments: This needs to be updated. Architectural records have entered the digital age. While traditional oversize blueprints are still in existence, more frequently these materials are born digital. This course needs to address e-records and various software programs for reading this type of record. |  | X |  |  |  |
| 3.. How **relevant/appropriate are the teaching and delivery methodologies** (lecture, video, PowerPoint, exercises, film, audiotape, discussion, simulation, case study, opportunities for in-course feedback, etc.) to the articulated goals and objectives, and to the content?"Comments: There was no documentation on how this course was taught. | X |  |  |  |  |
| 4. How workable is the **time line** or **agenda** for the course? Is there sufficient detail to indicate how the workshop will evolve? Does it allow sufficient time for active engagement between course participants and the instructor(s)?Comments: There was not agenda. This is listed as a 2-day. Perhaps it should be a 1-day. | X |  |  |  |  |
| 5. To what degree does the **list of assigned readings** support the content of the proposal?Comments: These was no list of assigned readings. | X |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Does the presentation support the Learning Outcomes in the descriptions?Comments: No presentation to review. | X |  |  |  |  |
| **A&D Track Considerations** |
| 1.Does this content bridge, enhance, and/or build on other workshops (If so, please name)  | I cannot assess: there was no material to review. In theory, I think this complements other niche materials workshops (photographs, rare books, oral histories….).  |
| 2.Does this build on other workshops not on the list? | N/A |
| 3 Should this be part of the A&D Track? |  Unable to tell. However, I would like to think that if this workshop was updated, it would be considered part of the A&D track.  |
| 4.Where would this workshop fall in the sequence of an A&D track? |  Introductory. |
| Why? | Introduces the subject of architectural drawings. |
| 5. What tier does this workshop fall in? (See attached tiers) | Either under Fundamental, or Tactical and Strategic. |
| 6. Target Audience | Archivists, town clerks, curators, librarians, and others responsible for architectural and other design and construction records, in archives, municipal and government agencies, museums, libraries and historical societies. |
| 7. Is the suggested prior “experience/knowledge” appropriate? | I couldn’t find “experience/knowledge” listed. Needs to include. |
| 8. Learning Outcomes: Are they appropriate and/or relevant?  | List of specific, measurable, and actionable outcomes that each person should be able to do (e.g. discuss, explain, evaluate, design) by the end of the course. |
| 9. What should they be?Please list learning outcomes. | Stated as Workshop Objectives: * Understand the process of design and how it impacts processing this material;
* Understand the special legal issues design records create;
* Identify types of records and their unique content;
* Develop methodologies for appraisal, arrangement, and description that are appropriate for different repositories;
* Identify specific media and supports;
* Recognize common types of deterioration and the actions needed for holdings maintenance or referral to professional conservators;
* Select storage and housing methods appropriate for their institution and budget;
* Make informed decisions about reformatting design and construction records for access and preservation; and
* Address specialized handling, reproduction, and use needs when providing reference and access for this material.
 |
| 10. Can you make suggestions for competencies this workshop would fulfill?  |  |
| 11. Would parts of the content lend themselves to a different format?  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Check one: Webinar:* 30 minute
* 90minute
 | In person:* 1/2 day
* 1 day
* 2 day
 |

 |
| 12. Which parts? |  |
| 13. Does it lend itself to repurposing as an audio CD? |  |
| Which parts? |  |

Other comments:

Clearly this workshop needs to be updated. It has potential, especially now that new architectural drawings and records are born digital. There are many tools out there (we use AutoCad) that allow you to create, write and read architectural drawings. How does one save those records created in a specific program? It’s not all about blueprints anymore. Perhaps the Architectural Records Roundtable should be approached to update this workshop. Or consult with them on what they would like to see in a workshop. Could be a 1 day workshop.