

Basic Program Information

Department Name: *Music*

Program Mission(s):

The mission of the Music Department is to provide an innovative, top-quality educational program that balances two distinct but complementary foci: 1) a traditional track that adheres to the basic guidelines of the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) and contains the courses in music history, theory/composition, and performance that prepare students for transfer to 4-year institutions and pursuit of a baccalaureate degree; and 2) a vocational track that adheres to guidelines provided by a board of advisors and contains the courses in music business, technology, and contemporary popular music composition/literature that prepare students for careers in the commercial music field. Both foci offer certificates and an associate of arts degree.

The department's mission is primarily in alignment with the college's mission to provide outstanding educational opportunities for all students through high quality transfer programs and career preparation. On a secondary level, the department's mission is in alignment with the college's mission to offer an associate in arts degree as well as opportunities for lifelong learning.

Program Review team members:

Name	Department	Position
Elizabeth Barkley	Music History and Literature	Elizabeth Barkley
Milissa Carey	Music History and Performance	Milissa Carey
Paul Davies	Music Literature and Theory	Paul Davies
Robert Hartwell	Music History and Fine Arts	Robert Hartwell
Eric Kuehnl	Music Technology	Eric Kuehnl
Janis Stevenson	Music Theory and Music Literature	Janis Stevenson
Bruce Tambling	Music Technology	Bruce Tambling

Total number of Full Time Faculty:	7
Total number of Part Time Faculty:	13

Existing Classified positions:

Programs* covered by this review

Program Name	Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.)	Units**
Traditional Music Transfer Program	A.A.	90

Music Technology	A.S.	90
Certificate of Achievement in Music Technology	CA	31.5
Certificate of Achievement in Pro Tools	CA	36
Certificate of Achievement in Music History/Literature	CA	20

Section 1. Data and Trend Analysis

1.1. Program Data:

Data will be posted on <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/programplans/programreviewdata.php> for all measures except non-transcriptable completion. Please attach all applicable data sheets to the final Program Review document submitted to your Dean. You may use the boxes below to manually copy data if desired.

Transcriptable Programs	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
A.S Degree in Music:General	3	6	+100%
A.S Degree in Music Technology	11	16	+45%
C.A. in Music Technology	2	3	+50%
C.A. in Pro Tools	0	5	+500%

1.2 Department Data

Dimension	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Change
Enrollment	5804	5595	-4%
Productivity (Goal: 546)	694	649	-7%
Success	66%	63%	-4.5%
Full-time FTEF	13.6	14.7	+8%
Part-time FTEF	6	8.2	+36%

1.3 Using the data and prompts, provide a short, concise narrative analysis of the following indicators.

1. Enrollment trends over the last two years: Is the enrollment in your program holding steady, or is there a noticeable increase or decline? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

The data indicates holding steady, with unduplicated headcount a 2% increase but a slight reduction in enrollment (-4%) due to a reduced number of sections (reduced from 225 to 224).

2. Completion Rates (Has the number of students completing degrees/certificates held steady, or increased or declined in the last two years? Please comment on the data and analyze the trends.

- a. AA, AS, AA-T, AS-T, Certificates of Achievement
- b. Local, non-State approved certificates- Certificates less than 27 units: All certificates less than 27 units without state approval should be reviewed carefully to determine if the certificate provides a tangible occupational benefit to the student, such as a job or promotion or higher salary, and documentation should be attached.

Student Success rate was 80% for 2010-11 and 76% for 2011-12. We have been in the process of creating a new certificate in Music History and Literature that will be available

starting Fall, 2012 and already have 5 students who have fulfilled the course requirements to receive this certificate.

3. Productivity: Please analyze the productivity trends in your program and explain factors that affect your productivity, i.e. GE students, seat count/facilities/accreditation restrictions. For reference, the college productivity goal is 546.

The department's productivity has been steadily high and above the average: 694 (2010-11) and 649 (2011-12). Several of the courses (particularly those in the History and Literature area such as Music 2 and 8) are exceptionally productive. This is worth noting because the Music 2 series consists of courses that, at most institutions across the country, are struggling to meet enrollment minimums. The courses that are not very productive (such as Music 12, 13, 14 and 15) are courses that have pedagogy- or facility-based enrollment restrictions.

4. Course Offerings: (Comment on the frequency, variety, demand, pre-requisites.) Review the enrollment trends by course. Are there particular courses that are not getting the enrollment or are regularly cancelled due to low enrollment?)
 - a. Please comment on the data from any online course offerings.

The Department communicates with the Division Dean to review offerings and make adjustments based on frequency and demand. For example, the Department made adjustments to the 2012-13 schedule to reduce offerings in courses that have declined in demand (e.g., Music 12) and to create new courses to meet additional demand (e.g., new full-time faculty member Eric Kuehnl is creating new curriculum such as Gaming Sound).

5. Curriculum and Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
 - a. Comment on the currency of your curriculum, i.e. are all Course Outline of Record (CORs) reviewed for Title 5 compliance at least every three years and do all prerequisites, co-requisites and advisories undergo content review at that time? If not, what is your action plan for bringing your curriculum into compliance?

The Department has made a huge push to bring its curriculum into compliance this year. It continuously and rigorously reviews curricula, and is committed to curricular improvement (e.g., consistency, currency) as the College moves from a paper-driven system to an electronic one. To that end, curricula (e.g. course outlines, certificates, and degrees) are updated, courses are deactivated when appropriate, prerequisites are revisited, and student learning outcomes are honed.

- b. Comment on any recent developments in your discipline which might require modification of existing curriculum and/or the development of new curriculum?
- c. Discuss how the student learning outcomes in your courses relate to the program learning outcomes and to the college mission.

The department's mission is primarily in alignment with the college's mission to provide outstanding educational opportunities for all students through high quality transfer programs and career preparation. On a secondary level, the department's mission is in

alignment with the college's mission to offer an associate in arts degree as well as opportunities for lifelong learning.

Especially in Music Technology, the faculty work closely to coordinate with other programs such as Computer Graphics, Video and Business in order to ensure curricular offerings are state-of-the-art, build on a broader base of expertise, and are as productive and efficient as possible.

d. As a division, how do you ensure that all faculty are teaching to the COR and SLOs?

All courses have SLOs identified and are up-to-date in the monitoring cycle. The areas of greatest challenge are those courses that are taught by adjunct faculty (e.g., Music 12)

6. Basic Skills Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Basic Skills, see the Basic Skills Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/basicskills.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
7. Transfer Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Transfer, see the Transfer Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/transfer.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
8. Workforce/Career Technical Education Programs (if applicable). For more information about the Core Mission of Workforce, see the Workforce Workgroup website: <http://foothill.edu/president/workforce.php>
 - a. Please discuss current outcomes or initiatives related to this core mission.
 - b. Please attach minutes from your advisory board meeting(s).
9. Student Equity: Foothill-De Anza Community College District Board policy and California state guidelines require that each California community college submit a report on the college's progress in achieving equity in five specific areas: access, course completion, ESL and basic skills completion, degree and certificate completion, and transfer. For the latest draft of the Student Equity Report, please see the ESMP website: <http://foothill.edu/staff/irs/ESMP/index.php>
 - a. To better inform the Student Equity efforts at Foothill College, please comment on any current outcomes or initiatives related to increasing outreach, retention and student success of underrepresented students in your program.

Section 2. Learning Outcomes Assessment Summary

2.1. Attach 2011-2012 Program Level – Four Column Report for PL-SLO Assessment from TracDat, please contact the Office of Instruction to assist you with this step if needed.

2.2 Attach 2011-2012 Course-Level – Four Column Report for CL-SLO Assessment from TracDat

Section 2 Continued: SLO Assessment and Reflection

2.3 Please provide observations and reflection below.

2.3.a Course-Level SLO

1. What findings can be gathered from the Course Level Assessments?

Because the courses offered in the traditional, transfer Music program and the courses offered in the Music Technology program vary widely in terms of core pedagogies (e.g., music history/literature; music theory/composition; music performance; recording and technology), they also vary widely in terms of assessment strategies. Furthermore, some courses are skill based while others are more conceptual. Faculty are working hard to ensure the Course-Level SLOs are assessing learning accurately and effectively.

2. What curricular changes or review do the data suggest in order for students to be more successful in completing the program?

At this point, we are looking at reducing the number of Music 12 offerings.

3. How well do the CL-SLOs reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need in order to succeed in this program?

Faculty are working hard to ensure that the Course-Level SLOs accurately and effectively reflecting the knowledge, skills, and abilities students need for the varied tracks within the program.

4. How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning in the program?

Faculty are working hard to ensure that they 'close the loop' in the assessment monitoring process so that following reflection, they make changes in the courses that do result in improvement in student learning.

5. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the course level, comment on the findings.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

1. What summative findings can be gathered from the Program Level Assessments?

The summative findings gathered from the Program Level Assessments indicate that the Department on balance is doing exceptionally well in terms of productivity and educational excellence.

2. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

The on-going curricular changes and revisions in the schedule are indicators of certificate and degree program improvements.

3. If your program has other outcomes assessments at the program level, comment on the findings.

Action Step	Related SLO assessment (Note applicable data)	Related ESMP Core Mission Goals (Basic Skills, Transfer, Work Force, Stewardship of Resources)	How will this action improve student learning/success?
1 Faculty will work with the Dean to analyze enrollment trends in order to maximize effectiveness and efficiency in course offerings.	Where appropriate, the Department will use SLO assessment data in decisions regarding course scheduling.	Transfer and Work Force	With a carefully constructed schedule of course offerings, students will be able to better plan how to complete the Department's A.A. and Certificate programs.
2 Faculty in Music Technology will focus on developing new curriculum that best prepares students for the work force.	As part of the curriculum development efforts, faculty will address SLOs and take appropriate steps to collect meaningful assessment data.	Work Force	With courses that better prepare them, students will be more successful in their efforts to obtain and remain in the work force.
3 Faculty in Music History/Literature will focus on developing innovative ways to deliver curriculum, especially digital textbooks.	The digital textbooks will integrate learning outcomes and assessment, thus making it easier to monitor course level SLOs.	Transfer	It is hoped that digital textbooks will provide students with enhanced learning experiences because of their ability to provide layered (rather than linear) content that incorporates improved listening examples,

		images, and video.
--	--	--------------------

Section 3: Program Goals and Rationale

Program goals should be broad issues and concerns that incorporate some sort of measurable action and should connect to Foothill's core missions, [Educational & Strategic Master Plan \(ESMP\)](#), the division plan, and SLOs.

3.1 Previous Program Goals from last academic year

Goal	Original Timeline	Actions Taken	Status/Modifications
1			
2			
3			

3.2 New Goals: Goals can be multi-year (in Section 4 you will detail resources needed)

Goal	Timeline (long/short-term)	How will this goal improve student success or respond to other key college initiatives	Action Steps
1 To maximize effectiveness and efficiency in course offerings.	On-going	With a carefully constructed schedule of course offerings, students will be able to better plan how to complete the Department's A.A. and Certificate	Consultation with the Dean.

		programs.	
2 To develop new curriculum in Music Technology that best prepares students for the work force.	Long term	With courses that better prepare them, students will be more successful in their efforts to obtain and remain in the work force.	Work through the curriculum development process as identified by the college's Curriculum Committee.
3 To develop innovative ways to deliver curriculum, especially digital textbooks.	On-going	It is hoped that digital textbooks will provide students with enhanced learning experiences because of their ability to provide layered (rather than linear) content that incorporates improved listening examples, images, and video.	Work with digital textbook publisher Kendall Hunt.

Section 4: Program Resources and Support

4.1 Using the tables below, summarize your program's unfunded resource requests. Refer to the Operations Planning Committee website: <http://foothill.edu/president/operations.php> for current guiding principles, rubrics and resource allocation information.

Full Time Faculty and/or Staff Positions

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Unbudgeted Reassigned Time (calculate by % reassign time x salary/benefits of FT)

Position	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

One-time B Budget Augmentation

Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale

Ongoing B Budget Augmentation

B Budget FOAP	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale
Turnitin Contract for Music 2 and 8	One of the faculty members is currently paying this out-of-pocket. Even \$500-1,000 in matching funds annually would help defray the costs.	The Music 2 and 8 courses have large enrollments and Turnitin supports faculty efforts to ensure Student Learning Outcomes are achieved by minimizing the amount of academic plagiarism and requiring students to do their own thinking and research.

Facilities and Equipment

Facilities/Equipment Description	\$ Amount	Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale
Sibelius 7 Academic for Music Theory		
“Clickers” for Music History and Literature course	Need Proposal	The Music History and Literature courses are the flagship within the Department in terms of productivity and reputation. “Clicker” technology in Room 1401 would enable the instructors to more clearly assess and document progress toward meeting Student Learning Outcomes.

Section 5: Program Strengths/Opportunities for Improvement

5.1 Address the concerns or recommendations that were made in prior program review cycles.

5.2 What statements of concern have been raised in the course of conducting the program review by faculty, administrators, students, or by any member of the program review team regarding overall program viability?

We believe the general budget situation and the overall problems in the world's economy require us to be as efficient and effective as possible. It is with these goals in mind that we identified our three core foci for the upcoming year: efficient scheduling, new curriculum in Music Technology, and new curriculum delivery (digital textbooks).

5.3 After reviewing the data, what strengths or positive trends would you like to highlight about your program?

	INTERNAL FACTORS	EXTERNAL FACTORS
Strengths	<p>The Music Department considers its greatest strengths to be its</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • broad-based, comprehensive curriculum; • award-winning, innovative, creative faculty; and • its state-of-the-art equipment and software applications that prepare students to successfully enter the work force. 	The Music Department has an excellent reputation in the professional music community, and the graduates of its Music Technology program are placed easily in the music industry.
Weaknesses	The lack of an Applied Music program and the restrictions on our performance program due to repeatability issues.	The general economic downturn and the perception that majoring in music does not lead to a viable career along with the impact of the repeatability restrictions.
Opportunities	To be in the forefront both in terms of curricular offerings and delivery systems.	To continue to work with music business and industry to identify supplementary funding sources.
Threats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state of the budget and declining enrollment trends district-wide. • Impact of repeatability restrictions. 	Proprietary Schools that offer music technology programs

Section 6: Feedback and Follow Up

This section is for the Dean to provide feedback.

6.1 Strengths and successes of the program as evidenced by the data and analysis:

The Music Department is the flagship program in the Fine Arts & Communication Division. Consisting of 2 distinct elements, Traditional Music and Music Technology, the Department is the driving productivity and enrollment element in the division. While most music departments have floundered in the past 10 years due to the inability to break away from the 1950's-1960's model of traditional 19th century coursework coupled with traditional ensemble offerings which offer students very few career pathways outside of music education (which has seen a precipitous drop due to lack of interest and budget cuts during the same period), Foothills' Music Department began a sweeping overhaul of curriculum and facilities beginning in the late 1990's that has culminated in the tremendous success evidenced by this program review. Everyone in the department is to be commended for their unflagging efforts to change the way we approach music education at Foothill.

The obvious success herein is the increase in number of transcriptable degrees and certificates awarded. 22 A.A. degrees awarded in 2011-2012 as opposed to 14 in 2010-2011, 8 Certificates of Achievement in 2011-2012 compared to 2 in 2010-2011 is a major accomplishment. The addition of the new C.A. in Music History & Literature available in Fall 2013 will only add to this success.

The greatest strength of the Department can be distilled down to: "The Music Department considers its greatest strengths to be its

- broad-based, comprehensive curriculum;
- award-winning, innovative, creative faculty; and
- its state-of-the-art equipment and software applications that prepare students to successfully enter the work force. "

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

I am concerned about the lack of an Applied Music course. This is an area that has consistently failed over the past 10 years, and I am at a loss as to why. With the constant requests my office receives for this kind of course, I am baffled by the fact that every time we offer it, the enrollment is below 10, resulting in its cancellation. This is an area that the department has identified in section 5, and hopefully, a solution can be found in 2013-2014.

Repeatability definitely presents a challenge for our class piano and guitar courses. Although our course offerings are leveled, many students wish to repeat endlessly in order to use our practice room facilities (which, it should be noted, are very nice

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

Other than developing a plan to address the concerns above, I have no suggestions for improvement, and would suggest the Music Department stays the course.

6.4 Recommended next steps:

Proceed as planned on program review schedule

1/4/13

Foothill College Online Courses

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Enrollment Trends

	2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
Unduplicated HC	2,088	2,310	11%
Enrollment	3,000	3,452	15%
Numb Sections	77	99	29%
WSCH	16,097	18,382	14%
FTES	358	409	14%
FTEF	7.1	8.8	23%
Productivity	753	696	-8%

Course Success

All Students			
	2010-2011	2011-2012	
	Grades	Percent	Grades
Success	2,208	77%	2,520
NonSuccess	468	16%	458
Withdrew	175	6%	355
Total	2,851	100%	3,333
			100%

Course Success by Targeted Ethnic Groups

Targeted Groups			
	2010-2011	2011-2012	
	Grades	Percent	Grades
Success	446	62%	619
NonSuccess	213	30%	230
Withdrew	60	8%	143
Total	719	100%	992
			100%

Not Targeted Groups			
	2011-2012	2010-2011	
	Grades	Percent	Grades
Success	1,901	81%	1,762
NonSuccess	228	10%	255
Withdrew	212	9%	115
Total	2,341	100%	2,132
			100%

Distribution by EthnicityGenderAgeHighest Degree

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
African American	386	11%
Asian	918	27%
Decline to State	250	7%
Filipino	124	4%
Latino/a	531	15%
Native American	38	1%
Pacific Islander	65	2%
White	1,140	33%
Total	3,452	100%

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
Female	1,468	43%
Male	1,984	57%
Total	3,452	100%

2011-2012		
	Enr	Percent
19 or less	681	20%
20-24	1,446	42%
25-39	909	26%
40 +	416	12%
Total	3,452	100%

Success Rates by Gender

2011-2012									
	Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total		
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
Female	1,088	77%	173	12%	153	11%	1,414	100%	
Male	1,432	75%	285	15%	202	11%	1,919	100%	

Success Rates by Age Group

2011-2012									
	Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total		
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	
19 or less	550	83%	79	12%	37	6%	666	100%	
20-24	1,055	76%	181	13%	159	11%	1,395	100%	
25-39	614	71%	140	16%	116	13%	870	100%	
40 +	301	75%	58	14%	43	11%	402	100%	

Success Rates by Ethnicity (multiple years)

		Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total	
		Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
African American	2011-2012	197	54%	104	29%	62	17%	363	100%
	2010-2011	121	52%	91	39%	22	9%	234	100%
Asian	2011-2012	793	88%	57	6%	50	6%	900	100%
	2010-2011	687	90%	60	8%	19	2%	766	100%
Decline to State	2011-2012	192	80%	24	10%	25	10%	241	100%
	2010-2011	310	78%	59	15%	27	7%	396	100%
Filipino	2011-2012	77	68%	20	18%	16	14%	113	100%
	2010-2011	69	69%	20	20%	11	11%	100	100%
Latino/a	2011-2012	345	67%	106	21%	65	13%	516	100%
	2010-2011	256	66%	102	26%	27	7%	385	100%
Native American	2011-2012	29	78%	6	16%	2	5%	37	100%
	2010-2011	11	61%	7	39%			18	100%
Pacific Islander	2011-2012	37	62%	15	25%	8	13%	60	100%
	2010-2011	14	64%	3	14%	5	23%	22	100%
White	2011-2012	850	77%	126	11%	127	12%	1,103	100%
	2010-2011	740	80%	126	14%	64	7%	930	100%

Notes and Definitions

Data is for the fiscal year, including summer (and Foothill's early summer in 2011-12).

Figures include Apprenticeship.

Enrollment trends include students counted for apportionment for those report years.

Success data excludes students that dropped after census.

Ethnic data reporting prioritizes multi-ethnic students to targeted groups.

Cross-listed courses are included in home department.

WSCH:

Sum of quarterly
End-of-Term Weekly
Student Contact Hours. 4 Quarters.

FTES:

Fulltime equivalent students,
(WSCH * 11.67) / 525.

FTEF:

Sum of teaching load
factors for Summer, Fall, Winter,
and Spring quarters,
excluding all release/re-assignments.

FT and PT Load:

FT - Fulltime assignment types
0 and 3 (on load, paid and nonpaid).
PT - Parttime all other assignment types.
OV - Includes assignment 2.

Productivity:

4-term total WSCH /
4-term total FTEF,
excluding all release/re-assignments.

Success %:

Number of students
receiving an A,B,C or P
grade / total number of
students receiving a grade.

Targeted Groups:

African Americans, Latinos, Filipinos

Release / Re-assign Time:

NonTeaching - 994 - Sick Leave

Teaching: -

991 - BHES

995 - PDL

996 - Release-Division

999 - Faculty Release-Contractual

Foothill College Online Courses

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Enrollment Trends by Course (multiple years)

			2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
MUS	F001.	Enrollment	211	170	-19%
		Productivity	676	681	1%
F002A		Enrollment	36	42	17%
		Productivity	577	673	17%
F002B		Enrollment	50	49	-2%
		Productivity	801	785	-2%
F002C		Enrollment	53	51	-4%
		Productivity	849	817	-4%
F002D		Enrollment	186	181	-3%
		Productivity	745	725	-3%
F003A		Enrollment	109	94	-14%
		Productivity	577	497	-14%
F003B		Enrollment	15	15	0%
		Productivity	#INF	238	#NAN
F003C		Enrollment	11		-100%
		Productivity	#INF		#NAN
F007D		Enrollment	115		-100%
		Productivity	614		-100%
F007E		Enrollment	21		-100%
		Productivity	337		-100%
F008.		Enrollment	708	746	5%
		Productivity	667	664	-0%
F010.		Enrollment	303	324	7%
		Productivity	971	865	-11%
F011A		Enrollment	49	176	259%
		Productivity	785	705	-10%
F011B		Enrollment	146	254	74%
		Productivity	780	814	4%
F018.		Enrollment	71	103	45%
		Productivity	442	634	43%
F050A		Enrollment	195	206	6%
		Productivity	819	660	-19%
F050B		Enrollment	45	95	111%
		Productivity	865	507	-41%
F058A		Enrollment	31	110	255%
		Productivity	#INF	1,028	#NAN
F058B		Enrollment	14	33	136%
		Productivity	#INF	#INF	#NAN

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/15/12

		2010-2011	2011-2012	% Inc
F058C	Enrollment	11	9	-18%
	Productivity	240	#INF	#INF
F060A	Enrollment	91	113	24%
	Productivity	765	453	-41%
F060B	Enrollment	33	17	-48%
	Productivity	555	286	-48%
F066A	Enrollment	34	43	26%
	Productivity	#INF	925	#NAN
F066B	Enrollment		26	
	Productivity		#INF	
F080A	Enrollment	9		-100%
	Productivity	#INF		#NAN
F081B	Enrollment	54	46	-15%
	Productivity	910	775	-15%
F081C	Enrollment	38	27	-29%
	Productivity	704	500	-29%
F081D	Enrollment	41	33	-20%
	Productivity	759	653	-14%
F081E	Enrollment		42	
	Productivity		778	
F082A	Enrollment	53	95	79%
	Productivity	981	588	-40%
F082B	Enrollment	16	26	63%
	Productivity	#INF	624	#NAN
F082C	Enrollment		20	
	Productivity		#INF	
F082D	Enrollment		20	
	Productivity		#INF	
F085A	Enrollment	42	109	160%
	Productivity	673	582	-13%
F085B	Enrollment	209	177	-15%
	Productivity	859	709	-17%

Success Rates by Course (multiple years)

			Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total	
			Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
MUS	F001.	2010-2011	144	72%	39	19%	18	9%	201	100%
		2011-2012	87	59%	26	18%	35	24%	148	100%
F002A		2010-2011	29	83%	5	14%	1	3%	35	100%
		2011-2012	33	80%	6	15%	2	5%	41	100%
F002B		2010-2011	41	85%	6	13%	1	2%	48	100%
		2011-2012	40	85%	3	6%	4	9%	47	100%
F002C		2010-2011	45	85%	6	11%	2	4%	53	100%
		2011-2012	48	96%	2	4%			50	100%
F002D		2010-2011	156	87%	16	9%	7	4%	179	100%
		2011-2012	158	91%	11	6%	5	3%	174	100%
F003A		2010-2011	58	57%	31	31%	12	12%	101	100%
		2011-2012	47	52%	30	33%	13	14%	90	100%
F003B		2010-2011	12	80%	2	13%	1	7%	15	100%
		2011-2012	11	73%			4	27%	15	100%
F003C		2010-2011	7	78%	1	11%	1	11%	9	100%
F007D		2010-2011	76	72%	26	25%	4	4%	106	100%
F007E		2010-2011	13	72%	2	11%	3	17%	18	100%
F008.		2010-2011	594	87%	56	8%	29	4%	679	100%
		2011-2012	647	88%	39	5%	46	6%	732	100%
F010.		2010-2011	276	93%	13	4%	7	2%	296	100%
		2011-2012	306	95%	5	2%	11	3%	322	100%
F011A		2010-2011	27	57%	19	40%	1	2%	47	100%
		2011-2012	115	68%	35	21%	19	11%	169	100%
F011B		2010-2011	96	69%	28	20%	15	11%	139	100%
		2011-2012	163	65%	33	13%	53	21%	249	100%
F018.		2010-2011	45	67%	17	25%	5	7%	67	100%
		2011-2012	55	60%	21	23%	16	17%	92	100%
F050A		2010-2011	123	68%	51	28%	7	4%	181	100%
		2011-2012	131	65%	53	26%	18	9%	202	100%
F050B		2010-2011	33	79%	8	19%	1	2%	42	100%
		2011-2012	62	67%	27	29%	3	3%	92	100%
F058A		2010-2011	21	70%	6	20%	3	10%	30	100%
		2011-2012	61	59%	16	15%	27	26%	104	100%
F058B		2010-2011	10	83%	2	17%			12	100%
		2011-2012	18	56%	9	28%	5	16%	32	100%
F058C		2010-2011	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	11	100%
		2011-2012	8	89%	1	11%			9	100%
F060A		2010-2011	54	61%	24	27%	10	11%	88	100%
		2011-2012	74	67%	29	26%	7	6%	110	100%
F060B		2010-2011	24	80%	5	17%	1	3%	30	100%
		2011-2012	13	76%	2	12%	2	12%	17	100%
F066A		2010-2011	19	63%	9	30%	2	7%	30	100%
		2011-2012	17	49%	8	23%	10	29%	35	100%
F066B		2011-2012	18	69%	2	8%	6	23%	26	100%

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/26/12

		Success		NonSuccess		Withdrew		Total	
		Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
F080A	2010-2011	5	63%	1	13%	2	25%	8	100%
F081B	2010-2011	22	43%	21	41%	8	16%	51	100%
	2011-2012	31	69%	6	13%	8	18%	45	100%
F081C	2010-2011	24	67%	9	25%	3	8%	36	100%
	2011-2012	20	77%	3	12%	3	12%	26	100%
F081D	2010-2011	34	89%	3	8%	1	3%	38	100%
	2011-2012	20	61%	9	27%	4	12%	33	100%
F081E	2011-2012	36	86%	2	5%	4	10%	42	100%
F082A	2010-2011	35	74%	5	11%	7	15%	47	100%
	2011-2012	60	67%	9	10%	21	23%	90	100%
F082B	2010-2011	9	69%	3	23%	1	8%	13	100%
	2011-2012	21	81%	4	15%	1	4%	26	100%
F082C	2011-2012	14	74%	2	11%	3	16%	19	100%
F082D	2011-2012	12	63%	3	16%	4	21%	19	100%
F085A	2010-2011	27	66%	10	24%	4	10%	41	100%
	2011-2012	71	66%	30	28%	7	6%	108	100%
F085B	2010-2011	141	71%	42	21%	17	9%	200	100%
	2011-2012	123	73%	32	19%	14	8%	169	100%