|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Responsive to the Component** | **Evidence** | **Analysis: Explanation/ Rationale of Assertions Supported by Evidence** | **Overall Judgment** | **Comments** |
| 1. What does the program do? | **Accepted with Required Changes. 1 pt.** 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. For example, the response alludes to the seven key proficiencies the program teaches but does not identify them, as well as alludes to pathways for which the program prepares students but does not elaborate on them. |  |  | **Accepted with Required Changes. 1 pt.** 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. | I recommend 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. For example, what are some of the most common awards at our major transfer partners with which this connects or what are some of the most common transfer actions for our MUSI students. This type of information would enhance understanding of the purpose and value of the program. |
| 2. Program’s relationship to the college mission & strategic plan. | **Accepted with Recommendations.** While the response does address all of the prompt areas, some of the information is not explained or clear. 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?  | **Accepted with Recommendations.** As noted to right, some of the evidence does not prove the statement being made. For example showing course SLOs does not prove the students actually met them or that program actually develops these compentencies.  | **Accepted with Recommendations.** As discussed to right and prior, some assertions re not well supported. | **Accepted with Recommendations.** | 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, would be good to identify that. For the pathways goal, would be nice to show the Tarleton agreement.  |
| 3. Program relationship to student demand. | **Accepted with required changes**. The report does not address how students are identified and supported early on in the program. Some evidence provided is not analyzed. | **Accepted with Recommendations.** While the report does include evidence some of it is either irrelevant to the prompt (such as the general student success info) or not explained (such as the retention data) | **Accepted with recommendations.** 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, while the report does identify that strategic scheduling is important and that not having certain classes online is important, they do not include strategies for addressing. 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. The report should 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. The school’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. Section ends up with discussion on transfer partnerships |
| 4. What marketable skills should students have after completion? | **Revise/Revisit.** Response does not address the inquiry. While it does state the marketable skills there is no evidence this is what is valued by industry. | **Revise/Revisit.** This section does not have evidence. | **Revise/Revisit.** No evidence. | **Revise/Revisit.** Need to go back and include evidence that the program’s marketable skills are what is valued by employers, industry etc. | This section can be enhanced with evidence that these marketable skills are what employers want. |
| 5. How effective is the program’s curriculum? | Accepted without Recommendations | Accepted with Recommendations. Many areas had adequate evidence, but as noted at right there are some areas that need evidence to support assertions | Accepted with Recommendations. Generally, the narrative does support assertions with evidence well but at a couple points it does not. See right. | 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 – what exactly is the evidence this is an issue? For the section on using assessment evidence and instructor observations to identify SLOs that are issues for students, this needs to be supported with data either from assessment or students. For the section on completers, I am not sure what terms are meant by 2023 so I cannot tell if that year meets the benchmark. I recommend adding 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, for a nonexpert it is a bit hard to understand why the class sizes are so small, so a little narrative on that may strengthen your case that is effective. For the section on success rates, your chart on success rates got mixed into the class size charts – move to the section on success rates. 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% and action plan I actually see 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?  | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted with recommendations. I recommend enhancing arguments with the evidence noted at right. | Accepted with recommendations. I recommend enhancing arguments with the evidence noted at right. | Accepted with recommendations. | Based on the statement that the department does poll students about how they learned about the program and required courses, would be good to share insights from that 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? | Accepted without recommendations. | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | 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? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Both FT faculty and adjuncts participate in a wide variety of discipline specific professional development and engagement. |
| 9. [Optional] Is the program supported with facilities, equipment, and financial resources? |  |  |  |  | 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? | Accepted with required changes | Accepted with required changes | Accepted with required changes | Accepted with required changes | While this is a good summary of how past CIP has guided the department and the gains that were seen, The previous CIP is not attached as requested. Please attach. |
| 11. How will program success be evaluated? | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | Accepted without recommendations | 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 | Accepted without recommendations. The table is effectively filled and the outcomes have measures that will effectively demonstrate their completion. Action plan is clear. |  |  | Accepted without recommendations | 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, the narrative is well written and a good overview of the music field of student. At points, as discussed above, required elements are not addressed or the arguments needed stronger support or need to have support/evidence added.