Academic Program Review



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ACADEMIC YEAR** | 2013-2014 | [ ]  Basic Skills [x]  Transfer [ ]  Career Technical Education (CTE) |
| **PROGRAM** | Music |
| **DEPARTMENT** | Humanities |
| **DIVISION** | Arts, Letters & Learning Services |
| **SUBMITTER** | Dr. Van Decker |

**I. INSTITUTIONAL GOALS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**1** | **INSTITUTIONAL MISSION AND EFFECTIVENESS** – The College will maintain programs and services that focus on the mission of the College supported by data-driven assessments to measure student learning and student success. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**2** | **STUDENT LEARNING PROGRAMS AND SERVICES** – The College will maintain instructional programs and services which support student success and the attainment of student educational goals. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**3** | **RESOURCES** – The College will develop and manage human, technological, physical, and financial resources to effectively support the College mission and the campus learning environment. |
| INSTITUTIONAL GOAL**4** | **LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE** – The Board of Trustees and the Superintendent/President will establish policies that assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of student learning programs and services, and the financial stability of the institution. |

**II. PROGRAM GOALS**

1. **PAST – EVALUATION OF PREVIOUS CYCLE OBJECTIVES/PROGRAM GOALS (SET IN PREVIOUS YEAR)**

List your previous objectives/goals and associated Institutional Goals. All program goals must address at least one of the institutional goals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PAST PROGRAM GOALS**(Describe past program goals.) | **INSTITUTIONAL****GOAL(S)** (Check all that apply.) |
|  |  |  |
| **1** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #1** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review:** Stabilize the various music ensembles. | [ ]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4 |
| [x]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**       |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #2** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review:** Continue to reinforce the identity of IVC with its music ensembles to attract donor support through the IVC Foundation. The ensembles collectively performed approximately 20 concerts in the 2012/13 school year. | [x]  1[x]  2[ ]  3[ ]  4 |
| [x]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**       |
|  |  |  |
| **3** | **PAST PROGRAM GOAL #3** | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Program Goal from Last Program Review:** Bring some music courses back online since they were all discontinued by the administration last year. | [ ]  1[x]  2[x]  3[ ]  4 |
| [ ]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [x]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:**      We are in negotiation for approval to bring back a Music 100 and a Music 102 online class. |

Comments:

1. **PRESENT – DATA ANALYSIS AND PROGRAM HEALTH**
2. Summarize and analyze all disaggregated data by day, evening, gender, ethnicity, and distance education regarding enrollments, fill rates, productivity, completion, success, retention, persistence, and transfer (complete a, b, & c). ***Attach graphs or trend data***.
3. Discuss and chart the trends in enrollment and fill rate for each program by day and evening at the program level.

Our Day Fill over the last three years is down for Fall Semester from 156% to 118%. Our Day Fill over the last three years is down for Spring Semester from 154% to 106%. Our Ex Day fill over the last three years is down for Fall Semester from 68% to 62%. Our Ex Day fill over the last three years is up for Spring Semester from 59% to 60%. Our Online Fill is down from 60% to 0% because the administration discontinued our only online class (Music102).

1. What are the trends in productivity? (WSCH/FTEF) The goal is 525 as per state guidelines. A low number means that we are below target levels for productivity. For example, in a small class that has a mandated cap of 15 students, the fill rate may be 100% but the productivity number (WSCH/FTEF) will be very low. A class with a cap of 40 students with a 100% fill rate will have a productivity number close to or above 525.

The Fall productivity has gone from 622.46 (2010) to 570.34 (2012) and the Spring has gone from 619.02 (2011) to 589.62 (2013). We feel that our rates are still pretty good even with the drops in enrollment across campus due to budget cutbacks at the state level.

1. Discuss and chart the success and retention rates by day, evening (extended day), and online classes in each program and identify gaps.

Our overall Retention rates over the last three years is up for Fall Semester by 2% to 85% . Our overall Retention rates over the last three years is for Spring Semester by 1% to 82%. Our Retention Rates have improved, but only slightly.

1. Discuss and chart the success and retention rates in each program and identify gaps for five ethnic groups. (African-American, White, all Hispanics, Other, Unknown).

 Success rates are 77% for Hispanic students, 87% for white students, and about 80% for all the other ethnic groups, aggregated. Please note that this is higher than IVC's average and the California college system average.

1. Discuss the trends in the number of degrees or certificates awarded, if applicable. (You may be able to expand more about this in B.3 below.)

There have been six degrees awarded in the last three years (2010-2013) and five degrees from 2009 to 2012. One must keep in mind that many students transfer before completing their associate degrees.

1. What program changes, if any, will you recommend that you expect would have a positive effect on your students in your program, if applicable?

There are too many non-majors in “Music Theory” classes (M100) and not enough in “Music Appreciation” classes (M102). We recommend the councilors encourage non-majors to take Music Appreciation and not Music Theory. Music Appreciation is obviously much more beneficial to a non-musician than having to learn the difficulties of playing an instrument and the complexities music theory.

1. Summarize revisions, additions, deletions, or alternate delivery methods to courses and/or program based on the last program review.

The problem with the enrollment for the ensemble has been resolved by the addition of four classes levels in each ensemble. This alternative delivery method has proven to be successful so far.

1. Evaluate the program’s viability by addressing program completion, size (FTES), projections (growing/stable/declining), and quality of outcomes. For CTE programs, also include labor market projections, placement, and performance on external testing/exams (i.e. ASE, NABCEP) and industry-recognized credentials, placement, and performance on external testing or exams (NCLEX, ASC, NAP).

Our department and its instructors always take the maximum number of students allowed per class each semester and sometimes more. The program’s completion rates always could be higher, but that is not our only concern. Just as important is the fact that a music student must be totally prepared to transfer at a “Junior Level” of proficiency. The criteria for this level is clearly enumerated on every university’s website. We often find that many of our music students are way behind in their music abilities - or they are just beginners. Therefore, many music students don’t realize what it takes to be accepted into a university music program. We feel that preparing a music student for a successful transfer is just as vital as receiving their Associate Degree.

The FTES levels did drop in the Fall of 2011 but came back up in Fall of 2012 to 300 and the FTES levels for the Spring were similar - dropping to 259 but coming back up in the Spring of 2013 to 317.

**C. FUTURE – LIST OF “SMART” (SPECIFIC** **MEASURABLE ATTAINABLE RELEVANT** **TIME-LIMITED) PROGRAM OBJECTIVES FOR NEXT ACADEMIC YEAR TO ADDRESS PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, GROWTH, OR UNMET NEEDS/GOALS. ALL PROGRAM GOALS MUST ADDRESS AT LEAST ONE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL GOALS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FUTURE PROGRAM GOALS**(Describe future program goals. List in order of budget priority.) | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** (Check all that apply.) |
|  |  |
| **1** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #1**Budget Priority #1 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** The 300 building is on the Bond list for modifications and the goal is to get it done. | [ ]  1[ ]  2[x]  3[x]  4 |
| **Objective:** Turn the 300 building into a music building |
| **Task(s):** Dr. Decker has met with the architect and the basic blueprints were drawn out. When completed, the whole 300 building will be dedicated to music with larger classrooms, a chamber performance hall, a music computer lab room, a music library, storage rooms and more practice rooms. The tasks involved (too many to mention here) will take the efforts of many people and the instructors. |
| **Timeline:** We have been told 2 years. |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [x]  One-Time[ ]  Recurring | [x]  Categorical Specify: Bond | [ ]  General Fund | [x]  Facilities[ ]  Marketing[x]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[ ]  Staffing | $1,500,000Architect and Contractor TBD |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #2**Budget Priority #2 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** Upgrade the MIDI/Recording lab and Recording Studio equipment . | [ ]  1[ ]  2[x]  3[x]  4 |
| **Objective:** To replace our old out-of-date computer equipment and software.  |
| **Task(s):** The plans for a new MIDI/Recording lab and Recording Studio equipment were approved and now it must be ordered and installed. |
| **Timeline:** The new equipment and software is to be installed this summer. |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [x]  One-Time[ ]  Recurring | [x]  Categorical Specify: IT Upgrade | [ ]  General Fund | [x]  Facilities[ ]  Marketing[x]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[ ]  Staffing | $50,000Architect and Contractor TBD |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **FUTURE PROGRAM GOAL #3**Budget Priority #3 | **INSTITUTIONAL GOAL(S)** |
| **Identify Goal:** To improve instructional presentations of recorded music and of various music software. | [ ]  1[ ]  2[x]  3[ ]  4 |
| **Objective:** Purchase and install a new smart podium and a big screen monitor in the music room.  |
| **Task(s):** Get quote from IT. Investigate if this can be purchased out of bond money when available. Investigate other sources of money.  |
| **Timeline:** Get detailed quote by April 2014. Get decision by June 30, 2014. Current amount unknown.  |
| **EXPENSE TYPE** | **FUNDING TYPE** | **RESOURCE PLAN**(Check all that apply.) | **BUDGET REQUEST** |
| [x]  One-Time[ ]  Recurring | [x]  Categorical Specify: IT | [ ]  General Fund | [x]  Facilities[ ]  Marketing[x]  Technology[ ]  Professional Development[ ]  Staffing | $10,000IT TBD |
|  |  |
| **TOTAL BUDGET REQUEST** | $1,560,000 |

1. How will your enhanced budget request improve student success?

Building 300 has been scheduled for renovation to match the learning environment of other buildings on campus. The current recording studio is vintage 1975 and is obsolete. The current music room does not match nearly every other classroom on campus with smart technology. Smart technology provides for best practices in instruction to ensure that students can learn as at other community colleges and transfer on an equal footing to four year universities.

Comments:

**III. INSTITUTIONAL STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (ISLOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ISLO 1** | COMMUNICATION SKILLS |
| **ISLO 2** | CRITICAL THINKING SKILLS |
| **ISLO 3** | PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY |
| **ISLO 4** | INFORMATION LITERACY |
| **ISLO 5** | GLOBAL AWARENESS |

**IV. PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES (PLOs)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES**(Describe learning outcomes.) | **ISLO(S)** [Link PLO to appropriate ISLO(s).] |
|  |  |  |
| **PLO****1** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #1** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**    History: The student will know the stylistic and historic periods of music, and the music terminology needed to identify and understand all the elements of music.   | [ ]  ISLO 1[ ]  ISLO 2[ ]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[x]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:** Reading Quizzes and Listening Quizzes |
| [x]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:** We are always looking in to ways of improving our student retention and inspiring students to love and understand music. Dr. Decker: Quiz 1: 6-As, 2-Bs, 3-Cs, 1-F Quiz 2: 3-As, 2-Bs, 1-C, 2-Cs, 1-D, 1-F Quiz 3: 4-As, 4-Bs, 3-Cs, 3-DsDr. Davis taught 2 sections of this course (involving 105 students who completed the course). As both were imparted identical knowledge, identical testing procedures, etc., Hope will pool the results together. There were 49 A’s (46.6% showed exemplary mastery of the SLO’s); 42 B’s (40% showed good mastery of the above SLO’s); 11 C’s (10.4% showed satisfactory mastery of the above SLO’s); and 3 D’s (3% showed below-par mastery of the above SLO’s). |
|  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **PLO****2** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #2** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**   Music Theory: The student will have a knowledge of key signatures, evolution of harmonic development and fundamental keyboard understanding and skills.    | [ ]  ISLO 1[x]  ISLO 2[ ]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[ ]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:** Quizzes, keyboard demonstrations, flutophone performances. |
| [ ]  Met | [x]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:** Dr. Davis and Dr. Decker are always trying to find new ways to teach the complex concepts of music theory. We have both improved but we will continue to seek out new approaches.Decker compared two classes of which I teach. Using a scantron type quiz and a playing quiz. I got these results:Grade Class 1 Class 2A 35% 30%B 45% 50%C 10% 10%D 10% 10%F 0% 0%Davis: Out of a total of 118 students who completed the courses (all 3 sections); there were 73 ‘A’s; 25 ‘B’s; 11 ‘C’s; 7 ‘D’s; 1 ‘F’; and 1 ‘I’ (incomplete grade). Percentage-wise Success Rate:-62% = A21% = B9% = C6% = D 2% = F and I |
|  |  |  |
| **PLO****3** | **PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOME #3** | **ISLO(S)** |
| **Identify Program Outcome:**       | [x]  ISLO 1[x]  ISLO 2[x]  ISLO 3[x]  ISLO 4[ ]  ISLO 5 |
| **Measurable Outcome Summary:** Performance Juries, performance quizzes, live performance evaluations. |
| [x]  Met | [ ]  Partially Met | [ ]  Not Met |
| **Provide detail on any improvements/effectiveness and detail status on those not fully met:** All the ensemble directors see improvement in this area and will continue seek out new teaching methods in live performance along with continuing to use the methods described.  MUS 156: Of the 40 students who completed this course (and there were no withdrawals, nor, incompletes), the results were as follows:-  ‘A’s = 38; ‘B’s = 2. Percentage Success Rate: A = 95%; B = 5%MUS 171: From the introduction of the literature at the beginning of the semester through the concert (exam) on November 3, 2012, the students (\*with the exception of one co-enrolled high school student who was not able to be assessed due to an excused absence because of a conflicting concert with her high school orchestra) demonstrated the following using the literature studied:1) All\* showed improvement in technical skill on their instruments.2) All\* improved in their skills of sight-reading, rhythmic accuracy, and intonation.3) All\* demonstrated improved group dynamics, section playing, ensemble playing and (for section leaders) the role of the section leader.4) All\* exhibited knowledge of different stylistic performance practices, in this case: Baroque, Classical, and Romantic, as drawn from the literature studied.5) All\* exhibited knowledge of the musical repertoire of the chamber orchestra; in this case, Baroque, Classical, and Romantic, as drawn from the literature studied.6) All\* exhibited improved music reading and listening skills including interpretation of notation and style, historical and cultural context through the literature studied, in this case: J.S. Bach’s Second Orchestral Suite for Flute and Strings (Baroque), Beethoven’s Second Symphony (late Classical), and Sir Arthur Sullivan’s Overture to “The Pirates of Penzance” (light Romantic). MUS 172:Grade Assess 1 Assess 2 Assess 3 Assess 4A 43% 44% 35% 60% B 14% 12% 39% 19%C 25% 33% 22% 17%D 09% 07% 00% 00%F 00% 04% 04% 04%(Note: evaluations were done every 3rd week)MUS 177: All students exhibited knowledge of the styles to be performed and improved work as an ensemble. c. How will your program use this information to improve student learning? If curriculum changes will be made (i.e. course outline, course description, course activities), please explain.Davis: The process was effective.Decker: Being able to hear others while playing requires multitasking skills which take young musicians a long time to develop. I feel my instructional methods may need some adjusting for the concert band in terms of establishing goals early on in the semester.Baker: The SLO/ILO process provides for reflection and constructive criticism of the performing ensemble for the student and teacher. The outcome will always be the performance, using the rehearsal as data collection helps to focus and prepare the performance.      |
|  |  |  |
| **\*\*\*\*\* ATTACH PLO/SLO GRID \*\*\*\*\*** |

|  |
| --- |
| SLO Grid |
| Course | units | # SLOs Identified | SP 2011 | SP 2012 | SP 2013 | SP 2014 |
| MUS 100 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 102 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 110, 112, 210, 212 | 1 | 2 each | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| MUS 120, 122, 220, 222 | 3 | 3 each | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 140, 142, 240, 242 | 3 | 3 each | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 150, 152, 250, 252 | 1 | 1 each | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| MUS 156, 157 | 1 | 1 each | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| MUS 160, 162, 260 262 | 1 | 1 each | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |
| MUS 172 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 175 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 177  | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 178 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| MUS 200, 202 | 3 | 3 each | no classes | no classes | no classes | no classes |
| MUS 182, 184 | 2 | 4 each | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |
| Student Learning Outcomes Assessment: |
| All SLOs have been identified and most classes have had three assessed.  |
| SLO assessments are done in spring semesters. |
|   |
| PLO Grid |
|  |
| **Program** | **PLOs Identified** | **SP 2011** | **SP 2012** | **SP 2013** | **SP 2014** |   |
| **MUSIC**  | **3** | 1 | 2 | 3 |   |   |