

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 and 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- If your program has other outcomes assessments at the course level, comment on the findings.

2.3.b Program-Level SLO

- 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.

- 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.

- 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, Craigs List 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 success 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	The Music Technology Program considers its greatest strengths to be its <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%

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%

Course Success

	All Students			
	2010-2011		2011-2012	
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
Success	4,436	80%	4,107	76%
NonSuccess	752	14%	736	14%
Withdrew	362	7%	544	10%
Total	5,550	100%	5,387	100%

Release/Re-assignTime

	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	Percent
Success	857	66%	972	63%
NonSuccess	324	25%	350	23%
Withdrew	125	10%	211	14%
Total	1,306	100%	1,533	100%

	Not Targeted Groups			
	2011-2012		2010-2011	
	Grades	Percent	Grades	Percent
Success	3,135	81%	3,579	84%
NonSuccess	386	10%	428	10%
Withdrew	333	9%	237	6%
Total	3,854	100%	4,244	100%

Distribution by Ethnicity

	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%

Gender

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

Age

	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%

Highest Degree

	2011-2012	
	Enr	Percent
BA/BS +	753	13%
AA/AS	167	3%
Special Admit	80	1%
All Other	4,595	82%
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)

		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

PROGRAM REVIEW DATA

10/09/12

Foothill College

Music-FH

Fine Arts & Communications

Success Rates by Course (multiple years)

			Success		NonSuccess		Withdraw		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		Withdrawn		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		Withdraw		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%