

Basic Program Information

Department Name: Music Technology

Program Mission(s):

The mission of the Music Technology Program is to provide an innovative educational program that 1) prepares students for transfer to 4-year institutions to pursue a baccalaureate degree and 2) prepares students for careers in the commercial music field with vocational training in music business, technology, and contemporary music production. The Music Technology Program offers certificates and an associate of arts degree with cutting edge curriculum and instruction in the areas of media studies, recording arts and audio production based on real world industry standards. It is the workforce element of the Music Department.

The Music Technology's Program mission is 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 |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Bruce Tambling | Music Technology: All | Director, Music Technology Program |
| Eric Kuehnl | Music Technology: All | Co-Director, Music Technology Program |

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Total number of Full Time Faculty: | 2 |
| Total number of Part Time Faculty: | 6 |

Programs* covered by this review

| Program Name | Program Type (A.S., C.A., Pathway, etc.) | Units** |
|--|--|---------|
| Music Technology Associate of Arts Degree | A.A. | 90 |
| Certificate of Achievement in Music Technology | C.A. | 31.5 |
| Certificate of Achievement in Pro Tools | C.A. | 36 |

*If you have a supporting program or pathway in your area for which you will be making resource requests, please analyze it within this program review. For example, ESLL, Math My Way, etc. You will only need to address those data elements that apply.

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.A. 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 | 5,804 | 5,595 | -4% |
| Productivity (Goal: 546) | 694 | 649 | -7% |
| Success | 80% | 76% | -5% |
| Full-time FTEF | 13.6 | 14.7 | +8% |
| Part-time FTEF | 13 | 14 | +7.69% |

Department Course Data (Attach data provided by IR or manually complete chart below)

| Course | 2010-2011 | | | 2011-2012 | | |
|-------------|-----------|-------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|
| | Enroll. | Prod. | Success | Enroll. | Prod. | Success |
| MUS 50A | 181 | 889 | 68% | 206 | 660 | 65% |
| MUS 50B | 42 | 805 | 79% | 95 | 507 | 77% |
| MUS 58A | 73 | 817 | 68% | 163 | 1,016 | 63% |
| MUS 58B | 32 | 650 | 83% | 47 | 879 | 67% |
| MUS 58C | 26 | 636 | 73% | 35 | 584 | 97% |
| MUS 60A | 88 | 704 | 61% | 113 | 453 | 67% |
| MUS 60B | 30 | 503 | 80% | 17 | 286 | 76% |
| MUS 64A/11A | 47 | 752 | 57% | 176 | 780 | 92% |
| MUS 64B/11B | 139 | 768 | 69% | 254 | 814 | 89% |
| MUS 66A | 111 | 831 | 80% | 128 | 835 | 59% |
| MUS 66B | 100 | 739 | 80% | 140 | 651 | 53% |

| | | | | | | |
|---------|------|------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| MUS 80A | 59 | 747 | 80% | 36 | 672 | 63% |
| MUS 81A | 31 | 824 | 80% | 40 | 741 | 74% |
| MUS 81B | 98 | 916 | 80% | 79 | 666 | 65% |
| MUS 81C | 73 | 775 | 80% | 65 | 729 | 76% |
| MUS 81D | 38 | 905 | 80% | 33 | 653 | 61% |
| MUS 81E | NA | NA | NA | 42 | 778 | 81% |
| MUS 82A | 79 | 778 | 80% | 123 | 761 | 67% |
| MUS 82B | 40 | 888 | 80% | 55 | 1,165 | 84% |
| MUS 82C | 39 | 833 | 80% | 48 | 889 | 74% |
| MUS 82D | 49 | 1046 | 80% | 44 | 821 | 68% |
| MUS 85A | 1046 | 672 | 80% | 109 | 582 | 66% |
| MUS 85B | 200 | 847 | 80% | 177 | 709 | 73% |

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.

Enrollment in Music Technology has been steadily increasing over the past 3 years. Also, several factors have no data available: in 2009 we began offering fully online non-loaded sections of courses to increase productivity and improve student access for the newer online students. For example, it would appear that enrollment in MUS 66A, one of our most popular courses is declining, but factoring in the non-loaded additional sections offered each quarter, enrollment has actually doubled (not reflected in the data above)

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.

Certificates have increased 50%, AA degrees have increased 45%. Music Technology teaches courses that lead to professional certifications (meaning professional certifications from industry, not the state) and those certifications have increased over the past 3 years.

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.

Productivity has consistently remained in the mid to high 600's, well above the target of 546.

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 Music Tech faculty communicates with the Division Dean to review offerings and make adjustments based on frequency and demand. New courses are created to meet additional demand (for example new full-time faculty member Eric Kuehnl is creating new curriculum such as Pro Tools and Game Audio). There are no pre-requisites in Music Technology, only advisories. There has not been a class cancellation due to low enrollment over the past 3 years. We try to offer as many MT classes as we can every quarter based on instructor availability.

4. 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 Music Technology Program 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. All Music Technology courses are reviewed yearly as the content of the discipline changes so rapidly.

- 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 Music Technology Program'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. The Music Technology 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. For the past few years all Music Tech CORs and SLOs have been maintained by one faculty member, with the help of the Division Dean.

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 Music Technology program vary widely in terms of core pedagogies (music history, music business, 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?

Some Music Tech classes are offered only once per year or once every two years. We are working to organize and publish our class schedules two years in advance so students can plan accordingly to meet their degree, certificate and transfer goals.

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

The Music Technology CL-SLOs offer accurate data to help insure students succeed in the 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 Music Technology Program Department 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.

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 Improve acoustics in studio 1101 | 4 years | New designs and acoustical | ongoing |

| | | | |
|---|---------|---|-------------|
| | | measurements have been created. | |
| 2 Continue developing original course materials applicable to our program needs. | 5 years | 3 new classes completed. | Met/ongoing |
| 3 Continue producing professional quality recordings | 5 years | 50+ recordings have been completed in 2011/2012 | Met/ongoing |

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 Improve acoustics in studio 1101 | 5 years | Improve student success by creating a professional level acoustic recording space. | Research room modifications and acoustical design. Initiate fund raising activities to raise required capital. |
| 2 Continue developing original course materials applicable to our program needs. | 5 years | New, state of the art cutting edge classes will be created and offered. | Instructors will create new courses and update existing courses with new material. |
| 3 Continue producing professional quality recordings | 5 years | We are implementing a new production business model in this area. | Secure liability insurance for commercial paying clients. |

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 |
|--|-----------|---|
| Studio Manager | \$7700.00 | 1/3 |
| Licensing fees to industry affiliates for software NFR's valued at \$65,000 per year. | \$4000.00 | 3 |
| Lab Assistant | \$500.00 | 3 |

Facilities and Equipment

| Facilities/Equipment Description | \$ Amount | Related Goal from Table in section 3.2 and/or rationale |
|--|----------------------|---|
| Appreciation Hall Sound System | \$25,000 - \$50,000 | The current loudspeaker system is obsolete and broken beyond repair. With an upgraded sound system, such as one from Meyer Sound, Appreciation Hall could be used for lectures, special events and concerts. Installing a functional sound system in Appreciation Hall functional would be of great benefit to all programs. |
| IDEA Center Web Video Broadcast Equipment | \$25,000 | By installing video cameras, wireless microphones and Internet compression hardware, the IDEA Center could produce videos of class lectures and stream the face-to-face classes live to our online students live in real time. |
| IDEA Center HVAC | \$25,000 | Upgrade the air conditioner system. Creativity requires fresh air. With all of the computer equipment generating heat, the IDEA Center's ventilation system is extremely inadequate. The IDEA Center HVAC system is also an acoustical problem because the noise floor generated makes it difficult for students to hear the music or the instructor. |
| Building 1100 Acoustical Upgrade | \$50,000 - \$200,000 | Building 1100 was not designed with professional acoustics required for a recording studio. There is no sound isolation between the walls, and the frequency response (sound quality) of all the rooms needs acoustical treatment. The HVAC system is totally inadequate for producing professional quality recordings and prohibits the studio from being rented out. By upgrading the acoustics of building 1100 students would have the opportunity to develop core competencies required for success in the workforce and we could generate additional revenue by renting out the facility. A professional recording studio would be an asset that would serve the entire campus. |
| Mastering Room in Building 1100 | \$50,000 | Convert one of the office rooms into a Digital Media Audio/Video Editing and Mastering Suite. This will help accommodate the growing number of |

| | | |
|--|----------|--|
| | | students that need access to professional equipment and production experience. It will also serve as a destination production facility to help all video projects at Foothill College. Any department or instructor that needs support producing professional quality videos for online class material will benefit from this facility. |
| Surround 5.1 Speaker System | \$20,000 | Video games, home theatre, network television and car stereos all deliver 5.1 surround audio. In order for Foothill College to remain current with the industry, we must upgrade our main recording studio audio control room to 5.1 surround. |
| Building 1100 Live Webcast Capability | \$50,000 | By permanently installing video broadcast and video streaming equipment, we can turn building 1100 into a broadcast quality Internet Streaming TV studio. This can be a premier destination for all departments at Foothill and also the general community. Will give students the opportunity to build portfolios and acquire practical experience with professional equipment and workflows. |
| Studio A Mixing Console | \$25,000 | The current Digidesign D-Command mixing console is obsolete. It has been discontinued and will no longer be supported. We should make plans to move the D-Command into the smaller Studio B control room and replace it with a new control surface in Studio A |
| Live Field Recorder | \$6,000 | A portable multitrack audio field recorder would be of great benefit to the entire school. It could be used to record panel discussions, committee meetings and special events. This audio recorder could be used to support video crews and would also provide students with hands on experience directly related to workforce opportunities and the professional industry. |
| Mobile Video Production Equipment | \$50,000 | A portable video production system would benefit all programs. Students could be trained to shoot videos of live events, lectures, meetings and concerts. Foothill College has fantastic instructors. But we are behind the curve with video production and delivering high quality HD videos of our lectures and special events. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | With YouTube, iTunes, Vimeo, Facebook etc. there has never been greater opportunity for educational digital media content creation. We have the talent and the facilities. We just need the video production equipment to capture, edit and broadcast the content. |
| Smithwick Theatre Audio Mixing Console | \$75,000 | By installing an Avid Venue digital mixing console in Smithwick Theatre , we can teach students about live sound reinforcement and concert sound for large auditoriums. Live sound is one of the fastest growing sectors in the entertainment and audio engineering industry. An Avid Venue mixing console would also elevate the quality of services offered by Smithwick Theatre and can be rented to the general public. |
| Advertising | \$5,000 | With additional Music Technology Programs opening all around the country, Foothill College has more competition. We need to maintain a presence with consistent online advertising and marketing efforts. Search Engine Optimization, Google Ads, Craigslist Ads, Banner Ads on music tech related forums should all be utilized to help drive students to our websites. |
| Promotional Videos | \$2,000 - \$10,000 | All of our programs need promotional videos. |
| Google Apps for Education | Minimal time from Foothill IT to help set it up | Google Apps for Education is free to colleges and offers the same features as Google Apps for Business which costs \$50/year for each user. By utilizing a subdomain like fa.foothill.edu, we could offer students a Foothill.edu email address , 25GB of storage and all the features included in Google Apps for Business. Google Apps for Education has been very successful with major universities around the world. |

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?

One of the greatest areas of concern is changes to repeatability. Many students who complete the program want to work on large scale projects under the guidance of an instructor. Changes to repeatability have threatened this option. We have already discussed the options, including CBE offerings, renting the studio on weekends, renting the IDEA Lab, etc., however state regulations

One of the major limitations in the Music Technology Program facility is the condition of the recording studios. Building 1100 was not acoustically designed and needs to be modified to adequately prepare our students with real world experience. The HVAC system is obsolete and poorly designed. Creativity requires fresh air. Adequate ventilation is needed in our recording studios.

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 Technology Program considers its greatest strengths to be its</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • broad-based, comprehensive curriculum; • award-winning, innovative, creative faculty; and • state-of-the-art equipment and software applications that prepare students to successfully enter the work force. | The Music Technology Program has an excellent reputation in the professional music community and the graduates of the 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 the music business 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 | Proprietary Schools that offer music technology programs. |

| | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| | restrictions. | |
|--|---------------|--|

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:

This is one of the flagship programs in the Fine Arts & Communication Division. It was one of the first professional audio programs in the State, and continues to be one of, if not the, best programs in the U.S. The program has garnered 3 League for Innovation awards and one California Music Award.

As evidenced by the data, Music Technology A.A. degree awards have increased 45%, the C.A. in Music Technology 50%, and the C.A. in Pro Tools 500. This is notable as enrollment has actually decreased by 4% across the board in Music/Music Technology. This indicates a much greater interest in completing the Music Technology Program at Foothill as there is no equivalent program at any CSU or UC. It should be noted that Foothill is the only College in the U.S. that offers a Certificate of Achievement in Pro Tools (Certifications by the manufacturer, AVID, are also available, but we do not have data regarding the number of our students who have applied successfully).

One of the areas that evidence the profile of the Music Technology Program at Foothill is the Guest Speaker Series. These speaking/lecture/demonstration events are in high demand throughout the Bay Area, and are always standing room only in studio 1101. Grammy and Academy Award winning engineers and producers freely donate time for these lectures.

Productivity remains very high in this program, as noted above, due to the high demand for this workforce program. In fact, this is by far the strongest audio technology program in the Bay Area and the state. With the addition of new full time faculty member Eric Kuehnl, the program is moving towards the gaming industry, the largest portion of the entertainment industry worldwide. Mr. Kuehnl has written 2 new classes to be offered beginning Fall 2013

6.2 Areas of concern, if any:

An area of great concern is the lack of a mastering suite, and the declining condition of the HVAC system in 1100. The system is extremely noisy, and because of massive rodent infestations in the roof/ceiling of 1100, we have been told that unlike other classrooms, the wiring will not allow the system to be turned on or off. This is a major disruption, and I do not understand why the infestation cannot be alleviated on at least a semi-permanent basis.

Another area of concern is the lack of an adequate lecture facility that has high end audio and video capabilities, which should be the function of Building 1500, Appreciation Hall. As noted above in section 4: "The current loudspeaker system is obsolete and broken beyond repair. With an upgraded sound system, Appreciation Hall could be used for lectures, special events and concerts. Installing a functional sound system in Appreciation Hall functional would be of great benefit to all programs." I would add that the system (at least the speakers) are 70's vintage and were not high end by 70's standards. Since that time so long ago, the drivers have been blown out by underpowered amplification. A high end audio-visual delivery theatre would be a showcase for the college and district.

6.3 Recommendations for improvement:

Begin turning room 1103 into a mastering suite. Install adequate soundproofing between rooms 1102 and 1101.

Address rodent infestation in 1100 to eliminate the problem, rather than waiting for it to re-emerge then hiring a temporary outside contractor/exterminator for a quick fix.

Begin to spec out and plan a surround sound system from a vendor such as Meyer Sound (or the equivalent) in Appreciation Hall with a digital projection system.

6.4 Recommended next steps:

Proceed as planned on program review schedule

1/3/13

Foothill College

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Enrollment Trends

| | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | % Inc |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| Unduplicated HC | 3,258 | 3,314 | 2% |
| Enrollment | 5,804 | 5,595 | -4% |
| Numb Sections | 225 | 224 | -0% |
| WSCH | 28,430 | 28,563 | 0% |
| FTES | 632 | 635 | 0% |
| FTEF | 13.6 | 14.7 | 8% |
| Productivity | 694 | 649 | -7% |

Course Success

| All Students | | | |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | |
| | Grades | Percent | Grades |
| Success | 4,436 | 80% | 4,107 |
| NonSuccess | 752 | 14% | 736 |
| Withdrew | 362 | 7% | 544 |
| Total | 5,550 | 100% | 5,387 |
| | | | 100% |

Full and Part Time Faculty Load

| | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | % Inc |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| FT Load | 4.8 | 3.7 | -24% |
| FT Percent | 36% | 25% | -29% |
| OV Load | 2.8 | 2.8 | 0% |
| OV Percent | 20% | 19% | -7% |
| PT Load | 6.0 | 8.2 | 36% |
| PT Percent | 44% | 56% | 27% |
| Total FTEF | 13.6 | 14.7 | 8% |

Release/Re-assign Time

| | 2012 | % Inc |
|----------|------|-------|
| | FTEF | FTEF |
| Teaching | 0.33 | |
| Total | 0.33 | |

Course Success by Targeted Ethnic Groups

| Targeted Groups | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | |
| | Grades | Percent | Grades |
| Success | 857 | 66% | 972 |
| NonSuccess | 324 | 25% | 350 |
| Withdrew | 125 | 10% | 211 |
| Total | 1,306 | 100% | 1,533 |
| | | | 100% |

| Not Targeted Groups | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| | 2011-2012 | 2010-2011 | |
| | Grades | Percent | Grades |
| Success | 3,135 | 81% | 3,579 |
| NonSuccess | 386 | 10% | 428 |
| Withdrew | 333 | 9% | 237 |
| Total | 3,854 | 100% | 4,244 |
| | | | 100% |

Distribution by EthnicityGenderAgeHighest Degree

| 2011-2012 | | |
|------------------|-------|---------|
| | Enr | Percent |
| African American | 511 | 9% |
| Asian | 1,417 | 25% |
| Decline to State | 444 | 8% |
| Filipino | 203 | 4% |
| Latino/a | 894 | 16% |
| Native American | 56 | 1% |
| Pacific Islander | 90 | 2% |
| White | 1,980 | 35% |
| Total | 5,595 | 100% |

| 2011-2012 | | |
|-----------|-------|---------|
| | Enr | Percent |
| Female | 2,270 | 41% |
| Male | 3,325 | 59% |
| Total | 5,595 | 100% |

| 2011-2012 | | |
|------------|-------|---------|
| | Enr | Percent |
| 19 or less | 1,152 | 21% |
| 20-24 | 2,282 | 41% |
| 25-39 | 1,340 | 24% |
| 40 + | 821 | 15% |
| Total | 5,595 | 100% |

Success Rates by Gender

| 2011-2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|--|
| | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | | |
| | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | |
| Female | 1,715 | 78% | 237 | 11% | 233 | 11% | 2,185 | 100% | |
| Male | 2,392 | 75% | 499 | 16% | 311 | 10% | 3,202 | 100% | |

Success Rates by Age Group

| 2011-2012 | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|--|
| | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | | |
| | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | |
| 19 or less | 905 | 81% | 144 | 13% | 73 | 7% | 1,122 | 100% | |
| 20-24 | 1,636 | 75% | 314 | 14% | 242 | 11% | 2,192 | 100% | |
| 25-39 | 917 | 72% | 203 | 16% | 159 | 12% | 1,279 | 100% | |
| 40 + | 649 | 82% | 75 | 9% | 70 | 9% | 794 | 100% | |

Success Rates by Ethnicity (multiple years)

| | 2011-2012 | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | |
|------------------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent |
| African American | 2011-2012 | 264 | 55% | 138 | 29% | 75 | 16% | 477 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 223 | 59% | 118 | 31% | 39 | 10% | 380 | 100% |
| Asian | 2011-2012 | 1,205 | 88% | 84 | 6% | 85 | 6% | 1,374 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 1,169 | 89% | 102 | 8% | 49 | 4% | 1,320 | 100% |
| Decline to State | 2011-2012 | 346 | 80% | 49 | 11% | 37 | 9% | 432 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 628 | 81% | 89 | 11% | 57 | 7% | 774 | 100% |
| Filipino | 2011-2012 | 138 | 73% | 30 | 16% | 22 | 12% | 190 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 118 | 71% | 30 | 18% | 18 | 11% | 166 | 100% |
| Latino/a | 2011-2012 | 570 | 66% | 182 | 21% | 114 | 13% | 866 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 516 | 68% | 176 | 23% | 68 | 9% | 760 | 100% |
| Native American | 2011-2012 | 44 | 80% | 9 | 16% | 2 | 4% | 55 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 36 | 77% | 11 | 23% | | | 47 | 100% |
| Pacific Islander | 2011-2012 | 51 | 61% | 21 | 25% | 12 | 14% | 84 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 39 | 65% | 13 | 22% | 8 | 13% | 60 | 100% |
| White | 2011-2012 | 1,489 | 78% | 223 | 12% | 197 | 10% | 1,909 | 100% |
| | 2010-2011 | 1,707 | 84% | 213 | 10% | 123 | 6% | 2,043 | 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 type 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

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Enrollment Trends by Course (multiple years)

| | | | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | % Inc |
|-------|------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| MUS | F001. | Enrollment | 345 | 319 | -8% |
| | | Productivity | 691 | 651 | -6% |
| F002A | Enrollment | 88 | 86 | -2% | |
| | | Productivity | 705 | 689 | -2% |
| F002B | Enrollment | 106 | 107 | 1% | |
| | | Productivity | 849 | 857 | 1% |
| F002C | Enrollment | 111 | 102 | -8% | |
| | | Productivity | 889 | 817 | -8% |
| F002D | Enrollment | 186 | 181 | -3% | |
| | | Productivity | 745 | 725 | -3% |
| F003A | Enrollment | 146 | 125 | -14% | |
| | | Productivity | 579 | 496 | -14% |
| F003B | Enrollment | 38 | 40 | 5% | |
| | | Productivity | 608 | 317 | -48% |
| F003C | Enrollment | 27 | 22 | -19% | |
| | | Productivity | 432 | 349 | -19% |
| F007. | Enrollment | 32 | 53 | 66% | |
| | | Productivity | 513 | 425 | -17% |
| F007D | Enrollment | 115 | | -100% | |
| | | Productivity | 614 | | -100% |
| F007E | Enrollment | 37 | | -100% | |
| | | Productivity | 593 | | -100% |
| F008. | Enrollment | 846 | 896 | 6% | |
| | | Productivity | 678 | 684 | 1% |
| F008H | Enrollment | 87 | 88 | 1% | |
| | | Productivity | 465 | 366 | -21% |
| F010. | Enrollment | 364 | 373 | 2% | |
| | | Productivity | 833 | 747 | -10% |
| F011A | Enrollment | 49 | 176 | 259% | |
| | | Productivity | 785 | 705 | -10% |
| F011B | Enrollment | 146 | 254 | 74% | |
| | | Productivity | 780 | 814 | 4% |
| F012A | Enrollment | 252 | 220 | -13% | |
| | | Productivity | 521 | 322 | -38% |
| F012B | Enrollment | 122 | 114 | -7% | |
| | | Productivity | 462 | 295 | -36% |
| F012C | Enrollment | 81 | 62 | -23% | |
| | | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F013A | Enrollment | 187 | 174 | -7% | |
| | | Productivity | 536 | 415 | -23% |

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

| | | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | % Inc |
|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| F013B | Enrollment | 49 | 45 | -8% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F013C | Enrollment | 32 | 14 | -56% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F014A | Enrollment | 56 | 46 | -18% |
| | Productivity | 316 | 260 | -18% |
| F014B | Enrollment | 19 | 17 | -11% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F014C | Enrollment | 10 | 10 | 0% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F015A | Enrollment | 117 | 19 | -84% |
| | Productivity | 331 | 322 | -3% |
| F015B | Enrollment | 25 | 7 | -72% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F015C | Enrollment | 5 | 1 | -80% |
| | Productivity | #INF | #INF | #NAN |
| F018. | Enrollment | 95 | 135 | 42% |
| | Productivity | 592 | 644 | 9% |
| F035. | Enrollment | 415 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | 719 | | -100% |
| F035B | Enrollment | | 114 | |
| | Productivity | | 856 | |
| F050A | Enrollment | 195 | 206 | 6% |
| | Productivity | 819 | 660 | -19% |
| F050B | Enrollment | 45 | 95 | 111% |
| | Productivity | 865 | 507 | -41% |
| F058A | Enrollment | 75 | 163 | 117% |
| | Productivity | 701 | 1,016 | 45% |
| F058B | Enrollment | 35 | 47 | 34% |
| | Productivity | 654 | 879 | 34% |
| F058C | Enrollment | 26 | 35 | 35% |
| | Productivity | 567 | 584 | 3% |
| F060A | Enrollment | 91 | 113 | 24% |
| | Productivity | 765 | 453 | -41% |
| F060B | Enrollment | 33 | 17 | -48% |
| | Productivity | 555 | 286 | -48% |
| F066A | Enrollment | 118 | 128 | 8% |
| | Productivity | 732 | 835 | 14% |
| F066B | Enrollment | 102 | 140 | 37% |
| | Productivity | 635 | 651 | 2% |
| F080A | Enrollment | 63 | 36 | -43% |
| | Productivity | 520 | 672 | 29% |
| F081A | Enrollment | 31 | 40 | 29% |
| | Productivity | 579 | 741 | 28% |

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

| | | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | % Inc |
|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| F081B | Enrollment | 104 | 79 | -24% |
| | Productivity | 876 | 666 | -24% |
| F081C | Enrollment | 80 | 65 | -19% |
| | Productivity | 744 | 729 | -2% |
| F081D | Enrollment | 41 | 33 | -20% |
| | Productivity | 759 | 653 | -14% |
| F081E | Enrollment | | 42 | |
| | Productivity | | 778 | |
| F082A | Enrollment | 86 | 123 | 43% |
| | Productivity | 799 | 761 | -5% |
| F082B | Enrollment | 45 | 55 | 22% |
| | Productivity | 840 | 1,165 | 39% |
| F082C | Enrollment | 41 | 48 | 17% |
| | Productivity | 765 | 889 | 16% |
| F082D | Enrollment | 50 | 44 | -12% |
| | Productivity | 933 | 821 | -12% |
| F085A | Enrollment | 42 | 109 | 160% |
| | Productivity | 673 | 582 | -13% |
| F085B | Enrollment | 209 | 177 | -15% |
| | Productivity | 859 | 709 | -17% |
| F12AL | Enrollment | 22 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | #INF | | #NAN |
| F12BL | Enrollment | 5 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | #INF | | #NAN |
| F12CL | Enrollment | 1 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | #INF | | #NAN |
| F13AL | Enrollment | 41 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | 339 | | -100% |
| F13BL | Enrollment | 24 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | #INF | | #NAN |
| F13CL | Enrollment | 11 | | -100% |
| | Productivity | #INF | | #NAN |

Foothill College

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Success Rates by Course (multiple years)

| | | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|------|
| | | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | |
| MUS | F001. | 2010-2011 | 241 | 72% | 67 | 20% | 25 | 8% | 333 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 160 | 56% | 74 | 26% | 53 | 18% | 287 | 100% |
| | F002A | 2010-2011 | 76 | 87% | 10 | 11% | 1 | 1% | 87 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 70 | 84% | 10 | 12% | 3 | 4% | 83 | 100% |
| | F002B | 2010-2011 | 90 | 87% | 12 | 12% | 1 | 1% | 103 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 93 | 89% | 8 | 8% | 4 | 4% | 105 | 100% |
| | F002C | 2010-2011 | 95 | 86% | 11 | 10% | 4 | 4% | 110 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 92 | 91% | 6 | 6% | 3 | 3% | 101 | 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 | 86 | 63% | 35 | 26% | 15 | 11% | 136 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 71 | 60% | 32 | 27% | 16 | 13% | 119 | 100% |
| | F003B | 2010-2011 | 26 | 72% | 4 | 11% | 6 | 17% | 36 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 32 | 84% | 2 | 5% | 4 | 11% | 38 | 100% |
| | F003C | 2010-2011 | 21 | 88% | 1 | 4% | 2 | 8% | 24 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 20 | 95% | | | 1 | 5% | 21 | 100% |
| | F007. | 2010-2011 | 21 | 66% | 8 | 25% | 3 | 9% | 32 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 39 | 76% | 5 | 10% | 7 | 14% | 51 | 100% |
| | F007D | 2010-2011 | 76 | 72% | 26 | 25% | 4 | 4% | 106 | 100% |
| | F007E | 2010-2011 | 27 | 79% | 4 | 12% | 3 | 9% | 34 | 100% |
| | F008. | 2010-2011 | 714 | 87% | 67 | 8% | 36 | 4% | 817 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 791 | 90% | 42 | 5% | 48 | 5% | 881 | 100% |
| | F008H | 2010-2011 | 82 | 95% | 2 | 2% | 2 | 2% | 86 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 86 | 98% | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% | 88 | 100% |
| | F010. | 2010-2011 | 317 | 90% | 23 | 6% | 14 | 4% | 354 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 338 | 92% | 10 | 3% | 20 | 5% | 368 | 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% |
| | F012A | 2010-2011 | 177 | 74% | 40 | 17% | 22 | 9% | 239 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 137 | 66% | 38 | 18% | 33 | 16% | 208 | 100% |
| | F012B | 2010-2011 | 97 | 83% | 10 | 9% | 10 | 9% | 117 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 83 | 76% | 16 | 15% | 10 | 9% | 109 | 100% |
| | F012C | 2010-2011 | 69 | 91% | 2 | 3% | 5 | 7% | 76 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 54 | 90% | 2 | 3% | 4 | 7% | 60 | 100% |
| | F013A | 2010-2011 | 162 | 94% | | | 10 | 6% | 172 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 140 | 88% | | | 19 | 12% | 159 | 100% |
| | F013B | 2010-2011 | 46 | 96% | | | 2 | 4% | 48 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 43 | 98% | | | 1 | 2% | 44 | 100% |
| | F013C | 2010-2011 | 30 | 94% | | | 2 | 6% | 32 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 14 | 100% | | | | | 14 | 100% |
| | F014A | 2010-2011 | 32 | 63% | 7 | 14% | 12 | 24% | 51 | 100% |
| | | 2011-2012 | 31 | 76% | 2 | 5% | 8 | 20% | 41 | 100% |
| | F014B | 2010-2011 | 13 | 68% | 4 | 21% | 2 | 11% | 19 | 100% |

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

| | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | | |
|-------|-----------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|------|
| | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | |
| | 2011-2012 | 11 | 69% | 4 | 25% | 1 | 6% | 16 | 100% |
| F014C | 2010-2011 | 5 | 50% | 3 | 30% | 2 | 20% | 10 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 9 | 90% | | | 1 | 10% | 10 | 100% |
| F015A | 2010-2011 | 89 | 82% | 5 | 5% | 15 | 14% | 109 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 14 | 78% | | | 4 | 22% | 18 | 100% |
| F015B | 2010-2011 | 21 | 91% | | | 2 | 9% | 23 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 6 | 100% | | | | | 6 | 100% |
| F015C | 2010-2011 | 5 | 100% | | | | | 5 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 1 | 100% | | | | | 1 | 100% |
| F018. | 2010-2011 | 64 | 71% | 21 | 23% | 5 | 6% | 90 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 79 | 65% | 24 | 20% | 18 | 15% | 121 | 100% |
| F035. | 2010-2011 | 384 | 93% | 18 | 4% | 9 | 2% | 411 | 100% |
| F035B | 2011-2012 | 89 | 79% | 20 | 18% | 4 | 4% | 113 | 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 | 59 | 82% | 8 | 11% | 5 | 7% | 72 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 97 | 63% | 17 | 11% | 40 | 26% | 154 | 100% |
| F058B | 2010-2011 | 27 | 84% | 3 | 9% | 2 | 6% | 32 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 30 | 67% | 10 | 22% | 5 | 11% | 45 | 100% |
| F058C | 2010-2011 | 21 | 81% | 2 | 8% | 3 | 12% | 26 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 34 | 97% | 1 | 3% | | | 35 | 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 | 72 | 65% | 28 | 25% | 10 | 9% | 110 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 69 | 59% | 29 | 25% | 18 | 16% | 116 | 100% |
| F066B | 2010-2011 | 67 | 67% | 26 | 26% | 7 | 7% | 100 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 71 | 53% | 42 | 31% | 22 | 16% | 135 | 100% |
| F080A | 2010-2011 | 43 | 74% | 7 | 12% | 8 | 14% | 58 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 22 | 63% | 9 | 26% | 4 | 11% | 35 | 100% |
| F081A | 2010-2011 | 28 | 90% | 3 | 10% | | | 31 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 29 | 74% | 8 | 21% | 2 | 5% | 39 | 100% |
| F081B | 2010-2011 | 51 | 52% | 35 | 36% | 12 | 12% | 98 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 51 | 65% | 15 | 19% | 12 | 15% | 78 | 100% |
| F081C | 2010-2011 | 49 | 67% | 17 | 23% | 7 | 10% | 73 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 47 | 76% | 11 | 18% | 4 | 6% | 62 | 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 | 50 | 63% | 14 | 18% | 15 | 19% | 79 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 79 | 67% | 13 | 11% | 26 | 22% | 118 | 100% |
| F082B | 2010-2011 | 28 | 70% | 8 | 20% | 4 | 10% | 40 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 46 | 84% | 6 | 11% | 3 | 5% | 55 | 100% |
| F082C | 2010-2011 | 30 | 77% | 7 | 18% | 2 | 5% | 39 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 35 | 74% | 7 | 15% | 5 | 11% | 47 | 100% |
| F082D | 2010-2011 | 37 | 76% | 8 | 16% | 4 | 8% | 49 | 100% |
| | 2011-2012 | 28 | 68% | 9 | 22% | 4 | 10% | 41 | 100% |

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

| | | Success | | NonSuccess | | Withdrew | | Total | |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|---------|----------|---------|--------|---------|
| | | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent | Grades | Percent |
| 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% |
| F12AL | 2010-2011 | 17 | 89% | | | 2 | 11% | 19 | 100% |
| F12BL | 2010-2011 | 3 | 100% | | | | | 3 | 100% |
| F12CL | 2010-2011 | 1 | 100% | | | | | 1 | 100% |
| F13AL | 2010-2011 | 39 | 95% | | | 2 | 5% | 41 | 100% |
| F13BL | 2010-2011 | 22 | 96% | | | 1 | 4% | 23 | 100% |
| F13CL | 2010-2011 | 11 | 100% | | | | | 11 | 100% |