

I. Program Description

A. What is the primary mission of your program (check all that apply):

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Basic Skills | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cultural and Personal Enrichment |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Transfer | <input type="checkbox"/> | Academic Support/Learning Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Career/Technical | | |

B. Program Description

If applicable, note the number of certificates and degrees that have been awarded in the previous academic year.

<http://www.research.fhda.edu/factbook/deanzadegrees/dadivisions.htm>

CTE programs refer CTE Program Review Addenda reports www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/resources.html

- 1
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Certificates of Achievement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Certificates of Achievement-Advanced |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | # of AA, AS Degrees |

2 If the program serves staff or students in a capacity *other than traditional instruction*, e.g. tutorial support, please answer the following two questions. Otherwise, skip to section II below:

a. How many people are served?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Faculty | | |

b. Number of employees associated with the program?

- | | | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Students | <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Faculty |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> | # of Part-Time Faculty |

II. Methods of Evaluation and Assessment

A. Attach the "Program Review Data Sheet". Briefly, address student success data relative to your program by answering the items listed below (refer to the link):

http://research.fhda.edu/programreview/DAProgramReview/DeAnza_PR_Div_pdf/DeAnzaProgramReviewDiv.htm

1 Growth or decline in underrepresented populations (Latina/o, African Ancestry, Pacific Islander, Filipino)

Explanation:	<p>The overall trend across the period was an increase in total number of "targeted" students, though the increase was primarily during the first two years. The total number of under-represented (or "targeted") group students in music classes increased from 616 to 686 between 2007-08 and 2008-09. The total number declined very slightly from 686 to 670 between 2008-09 and 2009-10.</p> <p>The percentage of "targeted" group students changed little during the period, being 19% in 2007-08, 19% in 2008-09, and 18% in 2009-10. The direction and magnitude of the percentage changes are similar to those of the college as a whole.</p>
--------------	---

2 Trends related to closing the student equity gap relative to college's stated goals: (refer to

<http://www.deanza.edu/president/EducationalMasterPlan2010-2015Final.pdf>, p16)

Explanation:	<p>The data show that progress was made in the most recent 2009-10 year toward the goal of closing the student equity gap.</p> <p>During the 2007-08 year the “percent success” among targeted students was 67% compared to 80% for non-targeted students and 78% for students overall, producing differences of 13% and 11% respectively.</p> <p>During the 2008-09 year the “percent success” among targeted students was again 67% compared to 81% for non-targeted students and 79% for students overall, producing larger differences of 14% and 11% respectively.</p> <p>There was significant improvement during the most recent 2009-10 year when the “percent success” among targeted students was 68% compared to 78% for non-targeted students and 76% for students overall, producing smaller differences of 10% and 8% respectively.</p> <p>In summary, over the three-year period, the gap between targeted and non-targeted groups decreased from 13% to 10%, the gap between targeted students and the college average decreased from 11% to 8%, and the overall “success” percentage among targeted student groups increased from 67% to 68%.</p> <p>Two significant points: First, the retention rate among targeted students improved from 80% to 85% during this three-year period. Second, during a time when the average music class size increased significantly (as indicated by a large increase in “productivity”), it is perhaps not surprising that there was a decline in the success percentage among the overall student population in music. However, even against that difficult background the success percentage of targeted students increased and the percent of targeted students “retained” increased.</p>
--------------	---

- 3 What progress or achievement has the program made relative to the plans stated in the 2008 Comprehensive Program Review, Section III.B, towards decreasing the student equity gap? See:
http://www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/program_review_files.html, "Program Review Reports, 2009"

Explanation:	<p>As described above, there has been steady and significant improvement in the form of a decrease in the “gap” between “targeted” groups and both non-targeted groups and the total population of students. To generalize, the size of the success “gap” has decreased overall by roughly 25% or perhaps slightly more, depending upon how that data are compared.</p> <p>An additional shift in the comparison values has also occurred. Among the targeted group students as a whole, the percentage who withdraw has decreased significantly, and the percentage of “retained” target group students has risen from 80% in 2007-08 to 85% in 2009-10.</p> <p>As mentioned elsewhere, these overall comparative improvements have been against a background of a slightly higher “non-success” rate among all students. We note that this is not unique to the music program, and that it has occurred during a time of increased economic stress and a significant increase in average class size in the music department. The “non-success” percentage among all students in music increased by 3 percentage points from 9% to 12%. The non-success percentage among targeted student groups increased by 2 percentage points from 15% to 17%. Given the budgetary and class size stresses it is not surprising that overall success rates have declined but the silver lining to this cloud might be that the percentage increase in non-success rates has been smaller among the “targeted” student groups than among the student population at large.</p> <p>Looking back at our earlier analysis of a higher withdrawal rate among “African ancestry” students, we noted that success rates among those students who were retained were quite high, and we concluded that non-success among the members of this cohort was largely a result of withdrawal from courses. We additionally noted that this pattern was different from that among other targeted sub-groups of students. With that in mind, we were aware of the need to focus on retention of African ancestry students. The department will implement a study of African ancestry students who drop by contacting those who drop and inviting them to tell us why they dropped and then studying the responses to determine what might be done. Also, the department will solicit from the Office of Staff and Institutional Development any successful models used elsewhere (on or off campus) for us to draw upon.</p> <p>A few years later, the results are complex and somewhat confusing. The retention rate did improve from 74% several years ago to 84% during the most recent year from which data are available, and at the end of this period the 84% retention rate among African ancestry students was very close the 88% retention rate of students overall. While that sounds like success, this seems to have been accompanied by an increase in the “non-success” rate among this student group. As we stated in the original review, the department would be interested in conducting a survey or otherwise trying to determine the reasons for this if resources for doing so are available.</p>
--------------	---

4 Overall enrollment growth or decline of all student populations

Explanation:	<p>The overall number of students enrolled in music department classes has increased steadily during the 2007-08 through 2009-10 period. The number in 2007-08 was 3, 328. In 2008-09 it was 3, 592. In 2009-10 it was 3, 817. This is an overall increase of approximately 15% during the three-year period. Much of the increase seems to have been accommodated by means of a shift in the balance between smaller courses and larger courses in the direction of favoring the courses with larger seat counts. Reinforcing this idea is the evidence of a significant increase in productivity levels in the music department.</p>
--------------	--

- B. Did your program implement any curriculum, program reorganization, etc. changes as a response to changes in College/District policy, state laws, division/department/program level requirements or external agencies regulations? How did the change(s) affect your program?

Change:	Course outlines updated incorporate SLOs. Changes to unit load and lecture/lab status of certain music courses.
Explanation:	As of this date all music department course outline updates and revisions are complete. As part of the normal process of periodic updates, we also added student learning outcomes (SLOs) to all courses as per new guidelines. In addition, the department modified the lecture/lab status and number of units/hours for many performance classes in order to make them follow consistent policies. It is too early to do an analysis of how the changes made in performance classes has affected outcomes for students.

- C. Based on the 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review, Section I.C., "Main Areas of Improvement", briefly address your program's progress in moving towards assessment or planning or current implementation of effective solutions.

See: http://www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/program_review_files.html, "Program Review Reports, 2009"

Explanation:	<p>As described in detail elsewhere in this program review update, the department has made significant progress toward closing the achievement gap mentioned in the previous review.</p> <p>In the 2008 program review document we continued to stress the need to replace our lost full-time classified support position. Data collected for the previous report demonstrated that typical California community college music programs that might be regarded as comparable to that at De Anza typically have one or more full-time staff support positions. This need is still unaddressed, and our students continue to face challenges due to insufficient availability of accompanists for classes, lack of management of the music libraries, insufficient resources for instrument repair and piano tuning, no one to manage and supervise open labs, and issues with the management of practice room access. The need for staff support has only increased with the addition of the new Visual and Performing Arts Center facility, where some uses have been negatively affected by staffing difficulties. Although we have a fractional staff position in the form of a part-time staff accompanist, this has proven insufficient for normal department accompanist needs. We emphasize that it is typical for community college music programs comparable to that at De Anza to have one or more full-time staff support personnel, that our previous staff support position was lost when a retiree was not replaced, and that other similar and smaller departments in the division have one or more staff support positions</p> <p>In our earlier report we noted the critical importance of extensive drill and practice outside of class time among students studying music, and the need for use of specialized facilities such as practice rooms, rehearsal space, and access to computers with a range of music software. At the current time, some of the physical resources are available including rehearsal spaces, piano labs, and a music classroom lab equipped with computers and software used by students in a wide range of music classes. The continuing need for a full time staff person and the loss of access to a division staff person who previously kept labs open for a few hours each week has increased the challenges in this area. Faculty have improvised to some extent by voluntarily keeping labs open outside of normal class time, and by allowing students from other classes access to the facilities during class time.</p>
--------------	--

As a result of outreach, performances, and other recruitment efforts, the number of student participants and level of performance quality of the large vocal ensembles have both increased substantially. This is one of the most exciting and promising developments in the department during recent academic years.

There have been reduced opportunities for solo performances by the department's pianists over the last two years due to a reduction in the offering of the most advanced of the piano classes. Nevertheless, the quality of performances of those who play seems to be maintaining at previous levels. In addition, Howard Na, former student and award winning pianist made an inspiring return to the college in performance.

The department's large ensembles continue to perform at very high levels despite the problems noted above with well attended concerts and enthusiastic audiences.

In the previous review we addressed the need for individual instruction for lower division music students with a performance concentration. This is the norm at four-year institutions in lower and upper division programs, and many comparable community colleges have programs in place to address this. However, program and scheduling decisions related to increasing productivity have significantly reduced our courses that attempt to provide something close to individual instruction. This will become critical should updated policies concerning the content of the music A.A. degree be implemented, and the department is considering several strategies that seem to work at other community colleges.

In the previous review we noted the importance of effective outreach and recruiting efforts. Outreach to prospective students has included music department performances and similar events at high schools attended by prospective De Anza Music students, along with joint performances with these high school groups at De Anza. Major performance ensembles participate in outside concerts and music festivals, and faculty members have participated as festival judges. We have supplied campus outreach coordinators with compact disks and video resources to use and to distribute to prospective students. Music department faculty regularly participate in annual on-campus orientation events such as the New Student and Parents Open House, and we follow up on student contacts made at these events. The previous review also noted the necessity of expanding the electronic music classes to include audio recording as well as integration with multimedia and film/video, important aspects of training for music students generally. The electronic music classes likely serve the greatest number of students enrolling in non-GE music classes in the department. Although electronic music course enrollment has continued to be strong among a diverse range of students, we have had to reduce sections as part of schedule reductions. While we continue to hear requests from students for additional courses in this area, expansion plans will continue to be on hold until the budget situation improves.

The previous review mentioned new courses related to piano accompaniment and film-scoring. These are still on our planning list along with a longer-term interest in providing training in the musical theater area. However, additional work on these initiatives must wait until a more favorable budget climate allows us to focus on expanding opportunities for our students rather than primarily on sustaining what we currently have in a workable form.

In the context of assessment, the department has established course student learning outcomes (SLOs) and departmental program level outcomes (PLOs). SLOs have been finalized for all currently offered courses, and commitments to assess have been created for a large number of courses. At the time this document is being written, several courses have already proceeded to the assessment stage, and additional courses will be at this stage by the end of the current academic year. Program level assessments have been written from two contexts – that of students focused on earning the A.A. degree in music and/or transferring to music major programs at four-year institutions, and that of students taking music classes in other non-music major contexts related to the college mission, including general education requirements and other educational goals in music. In addition to writing the assessment criteria, the department has identified a list of courses upon which program level assessment may be based and has mapped out a plan for sequentially assessing those courses as part of the department program level outcomes assessment.

D. Career Technical Education (CTE) programs, provide regional, state, and labor market data, employment statistics; please see "CTE Program Review Addenda" at:

www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/resources.html

Identify any significant trends that may affect your program relative to:

- 1 Curriculum content,
- 2 Future plans for your program e.g. enrollment management plans.

No significant change
Impact: No current CTE programs in the department
Explanation:

E. Career Technical Education (CTE), provide recommendations from this year's Advisory Board (or other groups outside of your program, etc.). Briefly, address any significant recommendations from the group. Describe your program's progress in moving towards assessment or planning or current implementation of effective solutions.

No significant change
Impact: No current CTE programs in the department
Explanation:

III Select IIIA or IIIB below:

Note instructions and materials for this section can be found at: [https:// www.deanza.edu/slo](https://www.deanza.edu/slo)

A. For programs whose primarily align to the Institutional Core Competencies, ICCs: attach the 2010-11 "Mapping Program Level Outcomes to Institutional Core Competencies" sheet(s) and "Program Level Outcomes Assessment Plan" sheet(s)

- 1 Describe the processes by which your program members have or will assess program level outcomes: (check those that apply)

x	course-embedded		surveys
Other, describe here:			

- 2 Review the ECMS-SLO Summary Report or SSLO Summary Report (*Division Deans shall be sent that report*). What percentage of courses that should undergo a SLOAC process are:

12.5	NA	8	complete	4	in progress	43.75	scheduled to be assessed
------	----	---	----------	---	-------------	-------	--------------------------

3 Below, briefly describe the level of engagement by your program staff and faculty with the outcomes assessment process (SLOAC, SSLOAC) since last year?

This year, all full-time music faculty have complied with requirements in this area. As of early April, SLOs for 45 of 48 courses in the catalog have been written (only 43 of these have been offered in the past year), with 18 having phase II completed and 4 through all 3 phases. Where applicable, teams have been created and are working toward completion of the cycle. We are on target to complete the SLOAC in a timely manner.

4 What program enhancements are you implementing as a result of the program level assessment process? Describe enhancements that do not require additional resources below:

summarize result:	The Music Department	plan/enhancement:	None as yet. Assessment will take place before end of spring quarter
summarize result:		plan/enhancement:	

B. For programs whose PLOs primarily align to the Strategic Initiatives: Attach the 2010-11 "Mapping Program Level Outcomes to Strategic Initiatives" sheet(s) and "Program Level Outcomes Assessment Plan" sheet(s):

1 Describe the processes by which your program members have or will assess program level outcomes: (check those that apply)

course-embedded surveys

Other, describe here:

2 Review the ECMS-SLO Summary Report or SSLO Summary Report (*Division Deans shall be sent that report*). What percentage of courses that should undergo a SLOAC process are:

NA complete in progress scheduled to be assessed

3 Below, briefly describe the level of engagement by your program staff and faculty with the outcomes assessment process (SLOAC, SSLOAC) since last year?

4 What program enhancements are you implementing as a result of the program level assessment process? Describe enhancements that do not require additional resources below:

summarize result:		plan/enhancement:	
summarize result:		plan/enhancement:	

Department Summary

PLEASE SEE PAGE 5 FOR ADD'L ITEMS IN SECTION V.B.2.

IV. Attach 2008-09 Comprehensive Program Review Budget Data Form. Add a column of data that lists the amounts allocated for the 2010-11 academic year.

See: http://www.deanza.edu/gov/IPBT/program_review_files.html, "Program Review Reports, 2009"

V. Resource requests include: staff, faculty, materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment

A. Please submit up to three faculty and/or staff requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed)

1	Rank	Replace	Growth
Position:	Support Staff Position		
Department:	Music Department	Contact person	Paul Setziol, chair
		extension	8512

1 Briefly state below how this person will enhance or maintain the status quo of your program plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program goals/plans below:

Statement: Community college music departments comparable to that at De Anza typically have one or more full-time staff assistants, as do other departments in the Creative Arts Division. The De Anza music staff position was not replaced following a retirement several years ago. Staff support is necessary to provide accompanists for classes, management of the music libraries, instrument repair and piano tuning, management and supervision of open labs, management of practice room access, support for use of the Visual and Performing Arts Center. Additional critical details and background concerning this issue are provided in section IIC of this program review update.

2 Highlight FTE, PT/FTE ratios, and WSCH that support your request below:

During the time that the department has been without its staff position, the number of students taking music classes has steadily increased and "productivity" (a function of WSCH and FTEF) has increased by a large margin. These two factors alone have increased the critical need for replacing the lost staff position in music.

3 If applicable, discuss PLOAC assessment results that support the program need for this resource below:

4 Please note: It is an expectation that all resources that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next Comprehensive Program Review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of this additional staff/faculty position to your program below:

Students in a variety of music department classes (including but limited to Music Fundamentals, Comprehensive Musicianship, Electronic Music, and various performance courses) are regularly assigned coursework that must be completed using department lab facilities. We expect that certain lab-based outcomes will improve with the availability of critical monitored lab time in such courses. We can also provide an assessment of the state of our music libraries and the availability of music to students in courses that require it. Appropriate availability of accompanist in classes in which this is currently limited or missing will contribute directly to meeting learning outcomes in those classes.

B. As applicable, list your requests for:

Materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment

refer to: http://www.deanza.edu/gov/techtaskforce/pdf/Measure%20C_Prioritization_Processes_ClgeCnclApproved6_10_10.pdf

Please submit materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment, requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed.) List 3 here, keep a prioritized list of all items on hand.

1	Rank	Replace	Growth	SEE PAGE 5 FOR RANK 2 AND 3 ITEMS
Item Description:	Technology "refresh" in A91 per district 5-year update policy			
Cost Estimate:	80,000-100,000			
Contact person:	Dan Mitchell		extension	8511

1 Briefly state below how this resource will enhance or maintain the status quo of your program plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program goals/plans below:

The A91 music classroom/lab is used by a variety of music and other classes in which students require access to computer labs facilities including the core two-year Comprehensive Musicianship sequence, Electronic Music, Music Fundamentals, and courses in other departments that have included Film/TV, Photography, and on occasions classes from other divisions. The lab equipment will have been in use for five years as of the end of the current academic year, and as per district policy is due for a technology refresh in order to maintain currency and reliability.

2 Highlight FTE, PT/FTE ratios and WSCH that support your request below:

The Comprehensive Musicianship two-year course sequence is the core of the lower division music transfer pattern and the A.A. Music degree. Electronic music classes provide critical experiences with current music software used by a wide range of students including music majors and others, and the courses are taken by the largest number of music department students taking classes other than the general education transfer survey courses.

3 If applicable, discuss PLOAC outcome assessment results that support the program need for this resource below:

PLOAC outcome assessments of the courses making use of this facility are scheduled but have not yet been completed.

4 Please note: It is an expectation that all resource that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next comprehensive program review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of this additional resource to your program below:

Criteria: Assessable criteria include those related to student learning outcomes in the range of music (and other) classes that depend on this facility and related both to specific skills and familiarity with current techniques and technologies.

Dean's Summary

VI. Resource Requests include: staff, faculty, materials, "B" Budget, facility refresh, Measure C equipment

A. Please submit up to three **faculty and/or staff** requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed)

	Rank		Replace		Growth
Position:					
Department:					
Contact person:					extension

1 In addition to the Department's rationale and from a dean's perspective, briefly state how this person will enhance or maintain the status quo of your program plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program goals/plans below:

2 Address FTE, PT/FTE ratios and WSCH that support your request below:

3 In light of the department's statements about assessment results, describe any additional need or service to the College this person may bring to the Division below:

- 4 It is an expectation that resource allocations (awarded 2 or more years prior to the next Comprehensive Program Review) will be assessed relative to their contributions to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you, as the Dean, may use to assess the effect of this additional staff/faculty position to your program below:

Criteria: [Redacted]

B. As applicable, list your requests for:

Materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment

refer to: http://www.deanza.edu/gov/techtaskforce/pdf/Measure%20C_Prioritization_Processes_ClgeCnclApproved6_10_10.pdf

Please submit materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment, requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed.) List 3 here, keep a prioritized list of all items on hand.

[Redacted]	Rank	[Redacted]	Replace	[Redacted]	Growth
Item Description:	[Redacted]				
Cost Estimate:	[Redacted]				
Contact person:	[Redacted]				extension: [Redacted]

- 1 From a Dean's perspective, are there additional factors to add to the Department's rationale for this resource request? How will the addition of this resource enhance or maintain the status quo of this program's plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program Goals? Use the following three sections below to state:

Rational here: [Redacted]

- 2 Highlight FTE, PR/FTE ratios and WSCH that support the request below:

[Redacted]

- 3 If applicable, discuss PLOAC outcome assessment results that support the program need for this resource below:

[Redacted]

- 4 Please note: It is an expectation that all resources that are allocated (awarded 2 or more years prior to the next Comprehensive Program Review) will be assessed relative to their contributions to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you, as a Dean, may use to assess the effect of this additional staff/faculty position to your program below:

[Redacted]

Department Summary (cont.)

Section V.B.2 continued from Page 3

V. Resource requests include: staff, faculty, materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment **(Continued from Page 3)**

B. As applicable, list your requests for: **(Continued from Page 3)**

Materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment

refer to: http://www.deanza.edu/gov/techtaskforce/pdf/Measure%20C_Prioritization_Processes_ClgeCnclApproved6_10_10.pdf

Please submit materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment, requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed.) List 3 here, keep a prioritized list of all items on hand.

2	Rank	Replace	Growth
Item Description:		Update Multimedia systems in A11, A31, and A91	
Cost Estimate:		40,000	
Contact person:		Dan Mitchell	extension 8511

- 1 Briefly state below how this resource will enhance or maintain the status quo of your program plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program goals/plans below:

These systems are due for a 5-year replacement as per district policy and/or need to be upgraded to support multiple projection sources and high quality audio for music classes.

- 2 Highlight FTE, PT/FTE ratios and WSCH that support your request below:

These rooms are used primarily for large enrollment classes and/or core music courses.

- 3 If applicable, discuss PLOAC outcome assessment results that support the program need for this resource below:

Assessments are scheduled for courses that will use this equipment.

- 4 Please note: It is an expectation that all resource that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next comprehensive program review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of this additional resource to your program below:

Criteria: In the case of all courses that use these facilities, student learning outcomes are based on outcomes that depend upon the use of this equipment in the classroom.

Please submit materials, "B" Budget, faculty refresh, Measure C equipment, requests below in ranked order: (copy this section as needed.) List 3 here, keep a prioritized list of all items on hand.

3	Rank	Replace	Growth
Item Description:		Jazz Practice Facility	
Cost Estimate:		5,000	
Contact person:		Bob Farrington	extension 8507

- 1 Briefly state below how this resource will enhance or maintain the status quo of your program plan to improve student learning relative to the campus Mission, Institutional Core Competencies, or Program goals/plans below:

This facility will be geared towards providing students enrolled in classes in jazz performance techniques with a lab in which to use compact disk and computer based practice software. The facility will incorporate audio playback equipment, computer, and "Band In a Box" software.

- 2 Highlight FTE, PT/FTE ratios and WSCH that support your request below:

These courses are major ensemble and applied music courses that are central to the A.A. in Music.

- 3 If applicable, discuss PLOAC outcome assessment results that support the program need for this resource below:

PLOAC outcomes assessment is scheduled for these courses.

- 4 Please note: It is an expectation that all resource that are allocated 2 or more years prior to the next comprehensive program review (2013-14) will be assessed relative to their contribution to the program, its course or program level outcomes and its program review criteria. In this light, briefly state some of the criteria you may use to assess the effect of this additional resource to your program below:

Criteria: SLOs for the courses that will use the facility will be used to assess student progress and success using the lab facilities.