|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **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.  The response does provide a basic statement of the purpose of the MUSI FOS, but does not provide detail that would enhance understanding of the program purpose and value. |  |  | Accepted With Recommendations  While this response does define the basic purpose of the MUSI FOS, understanding could be enhanced by responding to some of the suggested points to consider. | The Executive Summary references two charts/tables and discusses general information.  It also, skips questions 3, 8, and 9.  Perhaps detailing or defining what “robust” specifically means in this case be helpful. Additionally clarifying if there are 7 outcomes or 9 outcomes would clarify the information presented.  (Page 4 & 5 mention 7 outcomes but page 6 mentions 9 outcomes.)  The team recommends enhancing this response by going over the competencies this FOS teaches, perhaps what the courses are, and providing some specific examples of the pathways for which this award prepares students. |
| 2. Program’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan. | 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.  While the response does address all of the prompt areas, some of the information could be clearer, or elaborated. For example, why was retention the only student outcome focused on in this section and not other student success measures such as success rates and completion rates? (pg 7-20) | 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 With Recommendations | Pg. 8 – How often is “regularly” regarding advancing to Varsity Vocals? That sentence is a little confusing, or unclear.  11 grads with full scholarships is amazing!  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, and is there a specific process or is mentoring based on a student initiating/requesting mentorship? How many students perform in the Jazz Fest and how often is that event held?  Or for point #9 on page 9, How is adaptability, Flexibility, and a Growth Mindset being intentionally taught?  To establish connection to the mission and development of skills, abilities and character, the report details course level SLOs that connect to each of these areas. While this is evidence a framework exists that promotes these, it would be more effective evidence to share data that shows the students are effectively meeting these SLOs such as success data/assessment data if that is the approach you would like to take.  In the section on strategic goal contributions, why is retention rate the only outcome focused on for goal 1? Success rates and completion rates are indicators of overall program success. If there is a reason for this program that is the best measure, it would be good to identify that. For the pathways goal, it would be nice to show/include the Tarleton agreement. |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | (pg 21-32)  There appears to be a slight increase throughout the Music FoS, which is good to see.  Having noted that improvement, it would be even better if the report directly addressed how students are identified and supported early on in the program. Some evidence provided is not analyzed. | There is substantial evidence reported in this section.  While the report does include evidence, some of it seems to focus on areas not directly related to the prompt (such as the general student success information) or not explained (such as the retention data) | Some of the assertions are not supported by evidence. For example, the issues of unstrategic schedule or issues with web courses are not supported. The section about identifying students and supporting them does not include program-specific discussion. Some of the data included is not addressed or explained. | Accepted With Recommendations | In this section, the report does identify that strategic scheduling is important and that not having certain classes online is important, but does not seem to specifically include strategies for addressing those issues. Additionally the report notes that recruitment for guitar to enhance enrollment is needed but did not note any strategies.  In the item of identifying and supporting program students early on, the supports listed are more general in nature.  The report could mention specific strategies for supporting students in their progress in the program.  The report does note the program is more male than female, but states that mirrors national trends in music. Collin’s population is more female though, so not sure if there is a plan to address that. Program retention and satisfaction data is provided but without analysis. The section does conclude with a discussion on transfer partnerships. |
| 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 With Required Recommendations | 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.  This section can be enhanced with evidence that these marketable skills are what employers want. |
| 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. | Generally, the narrative does support assertions with evidence well, utilizing thoughtful and relevant analysis. A few areas/points could employ more thorough analysis (details in the comments). | Accepted With Recommendations | For section about barriers in the FOS, this is well supported.  The issues with success of piano skills classes could be elaborated on – for example, what exactly is the evidence this is an issue?  The portion of this response focused on using assessment evidence and instructor observations to identify SLOs that are issues for students, could be better supported with data either from assessment or students.  For the section on completers, some clarity of the terms would be helpful in communicating what is meant by 2023 benchmark completions. A recommendation would be to add a statement that you either do or do not meet the benchmark (fill out the included fillable area).  For the section about average class sizes, it might be confusing for a non-expert to understand why the class sizes are so small, so a little narrative on that may strengthen your case regarding effectiveness.  For the section on success rates, your chart on success rates got mixed into the class size charts – moving that information to the section on success rates, would clarify. While this section provides a lot of averages there are several individual course success rates in the 60s and 70s. Do these not warrant attention? If not, why? For the section on courses with success rates below 75% an action plan might be helpful. It seems there are more courses with rates below that than are discussed in this section based on the provided chart. Should those be addressed? |
| 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 With Recommendations | Some ideas regarding recommendations: Include a few insights and/or results from the poll.  Based on the statement that the department does poll students about how they learned about the program and required courses, it would be good to share insights from those poll results, and how they are incorporated, with examples.  A part of the narrative that could use enhancing is more specifics on how the faculty guide students related to the program. It would be good to explain in more detail what is included on the Canvas Hub, how students learn about that, etc. |
| 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 With Recommendations | What new relationships are being worked on/built currently, and perhaps include a Table Summary?  The program has a strong variety of external partnerships to benefit students, including with four year institutions, etc. |
| 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 how specific professional development opportunities added value section be more specific? | Accepted Without Recommendations | Both FT faculty and adjuncts participate in a wide variety of discipline specific professional development and engagement.  Perhaps a more specific breakdown of how the different professional development activities/events bring value to the program would be even better. For example, breaking the individual developments into categories of teaching pedagogy, building content expertise, and connection with professional organizations. |
| 9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | Pg. 129 “One of our newest classroom sopaces” should be spaces.”  The proposal outlines a number of challenges related to the program’s current space that impairs storage of equipment and practice ability for students as well as notes need related to equipment refurbishment. |
| 10. How have past CIPs contributed to success? | Included information on 6 CIP Outcomes  (pg.140-141) | Basic evidence to support progress/results for 5 of 6 identified outcomes. | General, brief analysis. (More elaboration on “overall improvements to your program”) | Accepted  (The previous CIP was sent to us as a pdf.) | The previous CIP was not included as an appendix, however upon communication with the authoring team contact the prior CIP was sent along to the review team as a pdf. |
| 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.  This section includes a succinct summary of the strengths and weaknesses of the program and the selected further CIP goals follow naturally from that discussion. |
| 12. Future Continuous Improvement Plan Table | Detailed outcomes, measures and targets for three CIP Actions.  The table is effectively filled and the outcomes have measures that will effectively demonstrate their completion. Action plan is clear. (Pg. 145-150) |  |  | Accepted | The future CIP naturally follows from the narrative, and has specific goals, effectively written measures and a strong action plan. |

**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:**

Overall a well-organized and written review of the program, there are a few areas where more evidence and/or the inclusion of poll results (instead of just mentioning the existence of a poll) would enhance the overall rating.