|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the program do? | (pg 7) This is a very brief response…of the 5 suggested points to consider the response briefly addresses #1, 3, 4, and 5 – for the #2 suggested point the primary note I could find states “seven key proficiencies” as learning outcomes/marketable skills. |  |  | Accepted w/Rec | The Executive Summary references two charts/tables and discusses general information. It also, skips questions 3, 8, and 9.  Would detailing or defining what “robust” specifically means in this case be helpful?  Are there 7 outcomes or 9 outcomes? Page 4 & 5 mention 7 outcomes but page 6 mentions 9 outcomes. |
| 2. Program’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan. | (pg 7-20) The Music FoS addresses many of the areas they are in accordance with the college mission and plan.  There is no mention of how the Music FoS relates to the Strategic Goal #2. | Tables 2.1-2.3 lists 20 learning outcomes, but does not show how many students satisfactorily complete or demonstrate mastery for those 20 L.O.’s  The other tables (2.4, and 2.5 pages 15-19 specifically) provide evidence of retention rates and mastery of three out of twenty learning outcomes, however 2.5 only gives specifics on learning outcomes for the first row. Row, 2 and 3 just say over 80% it would be great to have the actual number. | More evidence of items on pages 8- 10 would enhance the rationale/analysis of this section. (See comments to the right) for example on pg 10 there are 3 anecdotes, which are awesome, however more concrete evidence would be even better. | Accepted w/Rec? | Pg. 8 – How often is “regularly” regarding advancing to Varsity Vocals? That sentence is a little awkward/confusing.  11 grads with full scholarships is awesome!  Pg 8 & 9 – #4 point; How many semifinalist, and finalist rankings?  Several of the 9 items on pages 8 & 9 would be good to show evidence/proof/details on how those items are completed, or how they are achieved…for example #5. Mentorship & guidance; how many contact hours, is there a specific process or is it based on student initiating/requesting mentorship? How many students perform in the Jazz Fest and how often is that even held?  Or for point #9 on page 9, How is adaptability, Flexibility, and a Growth Mindset being intentionally taught? |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | There appears to be a slight increase throughout the Music FoS (pg 21-32) | Very thorough evidence throughout his section. | Clear & Direct Analysis. | Accepted W/O Rec. | Really extensive research/evidence/data driven section |
| 4. What marketable skills should students have after completion? | 10 specific marketable skills mentioned. (pg. 33 & 34) | Lacking evidence from national, state, and/or local employer surveys, studies and other sources that identify current employer expectations for BA graduates in program-related fields. | The lack of evidence in the section inhibits accurate/reliable analysis | Accepted w/Req Rec. | Some kind of evidence as asked for in the suggested/possible points to consider section of this section would enhance this section. Specifically; evidence from national, state, and/or local employer surveys, studies and other sources that identify current employer expectations for BA graduates in program-related fields. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Addressed clearly throughout this section (pg 35-61) | There could be more evidence (specifically for the question, “using assessment evidence & instructor observations…” no assessment evidence is included, there are 6 bullet points, but no assessment evidence. Otherwise there is ample evidence throughout this section. | Thoughtful analysis completed. | Accepted W/Rec |  |
| 6. How well does program communicate? | Included information on their online information (pg. 62-67) | In section one there is mention of a poll, but no results/evidence/etc. of that poll. | Direct answers/analysis | Accepted W/O |  |
| 7. How well are partnership resources built and leveraged? | Included a resource table with a focus on the description of the relationship and value added to the program. (pg. 68-73) | More evidence regarding the nature of some of the relationships in the resource table would be helpful. For example, what does it mean specifically that a “dynamic collaboration continues to grow” (pg 68)  Or for example, how many Collin students attended the Dallas opera last year? Page 69 states, “Over 300 students received free tickets to TDO during the 2022/2023 season”…but no mention of how many actually went? | A greater focus on the “how do we know” portion of this question would be beneficial for the analysis. | Accepted W/Rec | What new relationships are being worked on/built currently? |
| 8. Are faculty supported with professional development? | Very thorough listing of all professional development completed by faculty since 2018. (pg 74-127) | This section is full of evidence, with more in appendix #1 | Should the how it added value section be more specific? | Accepted W/Recommendations |  |
| 9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | Pg. 129 “One of our newest classroom sopaces” should be spaces. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | (pg.140-141)  Included information on 6 CIP Outcomes | Basic evidence to support progress/results for 5 of 6 identified outcomes. | General, brief analysis. (More elaboration on “overall improvements to your program”) And where is the previous CIP? | Accepted after the inclusion of the previous CIP | I do not see the previous CIP, unless I am missing it perhaps?  (The previous CIP was included later) |
| 11. How will program success be evaluated? | (pg.142-144) | Basic Evidence from previous sections referred to | Concise breakdown of 3 new/refocused CIP specific actions. | Accepted | Pg 142 again mentions student polls, but I have not seen the poll results. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table | (Pg. 145-150) detailed outcomes, measures and targets for three CIP Actions |  |  | Accepted |  |

**Overall Decision:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Accepted Without Recommendations | X Accepted With Recommendations | \_\_\_ Accepted with Required Recommendations | Revisit and Revise |

**General comments about the submission or rationale for the conclusion:**

After the previous CIP was included in as a pdf file in an email to the review team, the overall decision reflected “Accepted With Recommendations”. There seems to have been some confusion regarding how the previous CIP was to be included in the report, as it was understood by the authoring team that someone in IE would upload that document into the system, due to their form submission process being unable to add an appendix? The previous CIP is indeed uploaded.